

1985 ANNUAL REPORT

THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Written and Edited by Robert Van Buskirk
Proofreading by Marjorie Maxwell
Information and assistance provided by the IPUC's Accounting
and Finance, Consumer Assistance, Legal, Rates and Engineering
and Regulated Carrier Divisions

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
472 WEST WASHINGTON STREET
BOISE, IDAHO 83702

MAILING ADDRESS:
STATEHOUSE
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

(208) 334-3143

Commission Secretary	334-3172
Public Information	334-3415
Consumer Assistance	334-2178
Dir. Accounting & Finance Div.	334-3466
Dir. Rates & Engineering Div.	334-3768
Dir. Legal Division	334-3248
Dir. Regulated Carrier Div.	334-3092
Dir. Consumer Assistance Div.	334-3105

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Overview of IPUC	5
Commissioners	7
Organization of IPUC & Staff	9
Financial Summary	11
Idaho Power Company	13
Washington Water Power Company	19
Utah Power and Light Company	25
Citizens Utilities Company	29
Pacific Power and Light Company	31
Atlanta Power Company	35
Swan Falls Water Rights Agreement	37
Cogeneration and Small Power Production	39
Intermountain Gas Company	43
Telecommunications	47
Idaho Mountain Bell	49
General Telephone Company	53
Continental Telephone Company	57
AT&T Communications	59
Other Telephone Companies	61
Other Telephone Issues	63
Water Companies	65
Regulated Carrier Division	69
Consumer Assistance Division	73
Utilities Serving Idaho Communities	81
Listing of all Idaho Utilities	91
Residential Rate Comparisons	101

INTRODUCTION

Rate increase applications played a major role among the case load submitted to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission during 1985. Every major utility serving Idaho applied for rate increases.

In 1985 the Commission had before it requests for rate hikes totaling nearly \$161 million while the commissioners approved slightly more than \$31 million.

Idaho Power Co. was responsible for better than half of the requested amount. The state's largest utility applied to the Commission for permission to boost its rates in the amount of \$84.2 million - the largest rate increase ever requested by a utility operating in Idaho.

Although the dollars involved created increased public pressure from the public on the Commission, the number of rate cases was below the previous year. In 1984 there were 35 cases and only 23 in 1985.

But Commission activity is not limited to rate cases. It was a year of increased caseload with commissioners and staff actively engaged in the continuing problems resulting from the AT&T Divestiture, electric cogeneration rates and complaints, the continuing investigation of Washington Water Power Co.'s nuclear power plant involvement, and other utility matters.

More communities were requesting toll-free calling and 1985 marked a first for the Idaho Commission as it and the Washington Transportation and Utilities Commission held joint hearings and decided to allow toll-free calling across state borderlines. The two commissions approved the new service between Moscow, Idaho, and Pullman, Wash. General Telephone Co. of the Northwest is expected to begin the operation by mid-June of 1986.

In 1985 the Idaho jurisdiction had the lowest residential electrical rates for customers served by investor-owned regulated electric utilities.

For the northern Idaho customers of Washington Water Power, the lowest residential cost of electricity was 3.35 cents per kilowatt hour, while the nationwide average cost was 8.02 cents per kilowatt. Idaho Power Co. rates were just slightly higher than those of Washington Water Power. Both companies obtain two-thirds of their power from hydro.

The highest rate in the nation was New York City, where electric customers paid 15.35 cents per kilowatt.

Natural gas prices declined in 1985. Northwest Pipeline, which provides fuel to both Intermountain Gas Co. in southern Idaho and Washington Water in the northern section of the state, reduced its rates and passed along the reductions to both utilities. They, in turn, reduced rates to their customers.

Intermountain Gas rates were at 1980 levels.

Four Idaho industries obtained the cheaper natural gas by taking advantage of innovative transportation rates and "opportunity" gas access, a program begun by the IPUC in 1982.

Overall, Idaho's cheaper electrical and natural gas costs provided the state's industries a more competitive advantage.

The Commission also involved itself in the dilemma of the state's regulated carriers, who found themselves faced with ever rising liability insurance costs. Several carriers went out of business when they were unable to obtain the high-priced insurance and the Commission intervened in an attempt to find a casualty insurer to the carriers' problem.

During the year, the Commission authorized Union Pacific, Spokane International and Camas Prairie railroads to close many of their rail agency stations throughout the state on a one-year trial basis. The agencies would be replaced by Customer Service Centers.

Burlington Northern Railroad Co. also was authorized by the Commission to close its agency station in Coeur d'Alene. This action brought an Idaho Supreme Court appeal by the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks.

IPUC maintained the Fiscal Year 1984 level of 53 employees, excluding the three commissioners and five deputy attorneys general. The staff included 23 rate analysts, engineers and auditors, 11 personnel in the Regulated Carrier Division and 19 in the Administrative Division.

The Commission returned to the utilities and their customers in late 1985 a total of \$577,508 in unspent utility assessments.

Of 96 formal utility cases handled by the commission in FY 85 -- 13 more than in the preceding FY period -- 57 were electric, six were water, 24 were telephone and 11 were natural gas. The Commission received 23 cogeneration complaints among the 96 cases. There also were 23 audits of utility books conducted by the Accounting and Finance Division.

Processed and analyzed by the Regulated Carrier Division during the same period were 196 applications for transport authority within Idaho, 6,500 applications for private carrier permits and 10,221 applications for interstate transport authority. The Commission conducted 47 formal hearings on regulated carrier items and issued 290 formal orders. This did not count the numerous public notices.

Keeping with its policy to inform the public of utility and transportation issues, of hearings and decisions, the IPUC issued more than 200 news releases. It also issued public service announcements of the pending public hearings as well as distributed many other notifications to cities, chambers and community organizations.

Individuals requesting information on various public hearings also were notified by written reply and well over 300 individual letters were answered and returned to those protesting various rate hikes being sought by the regulated Idaho utilities.

The IPUC continued to update its computerized word processing system to increase efficiencies and to provide information more readily for staff and the public.

The Consumer Assistance Division of the IPUC received 1,939 requests for assistance in 1985. The number of complaints and inquiries received by the division during the year did not change significantly from the previous year. The greatest number of complaints and inquiries, 35 percent, involved a pending or actual disconnection of utility service.

Among other major complaint and inquiry categories were general information, 18 percent; disputed billings, 16 percent, and rates and policies, 10 percent.

OVERVIEW

The Public Utilities Commission of Idaho was established by the 12th Session of the Idaho Legislature and was organized May 8, 1913. In 1951, the Commission was reorganized and its name was changed to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. The primary responsibility of the IPUC, as outlined by the Idaho Code, is to set just and reasonable utility and common carrier rates and insure adequate services, while at the same time giving the regulated companies an opportunity to earn a fair rate of return.

By law, the Commission regulates investor-owned utilities and the intrastate operations of the transportation industry. The Commission's jurisdiction includes five electric utilities, 15 local telephone companies, one long-distance company, two natural gas companies, 24 water companies, six railroads, about 500 intrastate common carriers and thousands of interstate and private motor carriers.

As an independent regulatory body created by the Legislature, the Commission has quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and quasi-enforcement powers. For example, in its quasi-legislative capacity, the Commission sets the rules governing utility operations and must decide contested issues, such as whether a rate increase is justified. In its quasi-judicial capacity, the Commission hears customer complaints. Finally, the Commission enforces state law affecting utilities and motor carriers.

The three members of the IPUC are appointed by the Governor and are confirmed by the Idaho Senate. They serve staggered six-year terms. If a vacancy occurs when the Senate is not in session, the Governor may appoint a replacement subject to later Senate approval. No more than two of the commissioners may be of the same political party.

To help insure that Commission decisions are fair and workable, it maintains a staff of engineers, rate analysts, attorneys, accountants, investigators, economists and other support personnel. The staff analyzes each rate increase request, each application for an operating certificate and each complaint. The staff presents recommendations on these and other matters to the Commission. The IPUC considers staff recommendations along with others it receives from participating industry, agricultural, business and consumer groups, from the public and from the utilities it regulates.

The IPUC regularly conducts hearings on utility and transportation issues, usually in the service area of the utility it is considering, to allow for maximum public participation. The hearings are always open to the public.

THE COMMISSIONERS

Conley Ward, Jr was appointed to the IPUC in April 1977 by Gov. John V. Evans, and for a second term in April 1983. He served as Commission President from February 1979 to November 1980 and began his second term as President in April 1983. He is an attorney holding a J.D. degree from the University of Colorado School of Law and a B.A. degree from Columbia University. He was a Deputy Attorney General at the IPUC and was in private practice prior to his appointment to the Commission. Ward is a Democrat whose term expires in 1989.

Perry Swisher was appointed to the Commission in March 1979 by Governor Evans and was reappointed in February 1985 for a second term. He served as Commission President from November 1980 to April 1983 and was elected again as President in April 1985. Swisher served as an Idaho legislator for several terms in addition to his many years in the newspaper business and other private enterprises. Swisher was Chairman of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Taxation in 1977-78. He sits on the Idaho Advisory Council to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. He is a Democrat whose term expires in 1991.

Richard S. High was appointed to the Commission by Gov. Evans in March 1981. He served for 14 years in the Idaho Senate, chairing the Senate Finance Committee for 10 years and the Senate Judiciary Committee for two years. High is an engineer with 27 years of farm development and management experience. He is a Republican whose term expires in 1987.

ORGANIZATION OF THE IPUC AND ITS STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

The Administrative Division is responsible for coordinating overall IPUC activities. The division includes the three commissioners, the Commission Secretary, the Director of Policy and Administration, the Executive Assistant, the Fiscal Officer, Personnel Officer, Information Officer and clerical support staff.

The Commission Secretary, a post established by Idaho statute, keeps a precise public record of all Commission proceedings and meetings. The Secretary issues notices, orders and other documents to the proper parties and is the Commission's official custodian of official documents.

The Director of Policy and Administration oversees the entire workload of the IPUC and coordinates the activities of the various divisions. The Executive Assistant is primarily responsible for the fiscal operations of the Commission. The Fiscal Office oversees the budget, payroll, purchase and maintenance of materials and equipment, and personnel matters. The Information Officer is responsible for informing the public of Commission decisions, meetings and activities, responding to requests for information, coordinating public hearings and preparing materials that allow for effective public participation in IPUC proceedings.

LEGAL DIVISION

The IPUC staff is represented by five Deputy Attorneys General who are assigned to the Commission and have permanent offices at IPUC headquarters.

The IPUC staff attorneys represent the staff in all matters before the Commission, working closely with staff accountants, engineers and economists as they develop their recommendations for rate case and policy proceedings. Attorneys represent the staff in the hearing room and cross-examine other parties who submit testimony. They also represent the Commission itself in state and federal courts and in other state or federal regulatory agencies.

RATES AND ENGINEERING DIVISION

The Rates and Engineering Division is responsible for the economic and engineering analysis of utility rates and practices. This division may analyze, for example, the cost of providing a particular type of service and the fairness of its price. Economists may review the method the utilities use to forecast the need for new plants or the way a utility divides responsibility for costs among the several states it may serve. Engineers and economists also review the cost-effectiveness of conservation and cogeneration programs.

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE DIVISION

The Accounting and Finance Division is responsible for auditing all utilities to determine their proper income and expenses. When utilities request rate increases, for example, IPUC staff auditors analyze company revenues, expenditures, accounting methods and cost of capital. From these studies, staff accountants recommend how much revenue the companies need to earn a fair reasonable return.

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

The Consumer Assistance Division is responsible for working out disputes between utilities and customers. For example, customers faced with utility disconnects often seek help from the IPUC so they can negotiate payment arrangements. Consumer Assistance may also mediate disputes over billings, deposits, line extensions and service problems.

Consumer Assistance also monitors Idaho utilities to see if they are complying with Commission orders and regulations. It also participates in general IPUC rate and policy cases when it needs to bring consumer service issues to the Commission's attention.

Most consumers contact the Commission by telephone and most disputes are resolved without requiring the consumer to file a written complaint or visit the Commission's office in Boise. Division staff members make referrals to social service agencies, financial aid programs, or budget counseling services where appropriate, and negotiate payment arrangements with utilities on behalf of consumers.

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Financial Summary
FY-85

July 1, 1984 - June 30, 1985

Appropriation (Dedicated Fund)	\$2,842,700
Appropriation (General Fund)	<u>136,500</u>
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	<u>\$2,979,200</u>
<u>Receipts:</u>	
Collected from Utilities	\$2,386,404
Other Misc. Receipts	24,224
Motor Carrier Fees	453,732
Railroad Fees	<u>107,565</u>
TOTAL RECEIPTS	<u>\$2,971,925</u>
<u>Expenditures:</u>	
Salaries & Fringe Benefits	\$1,390,616
Travel	109,374
Professional Services	255,131
Other Services (Transcripts, Data Processing, etc.)	113,048
Communications (Postage & Telephone)	85,646
Materials and Supplies	53,263
Rentals	157,303
Repairs & Maintenance	21,893
Misc. Expenditures	<u>1,690</u>
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	<u>\$2,187,964</u>
Capital Outlay	206,453
GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES	<u>\$2,394,417</u>
Unexpended Balance of Receipts	
Subject to Refund to Utilities	<u>\$ 577,508</u>

(Legislature transferred \$136,500 to the General Fund
to pay Commissioners' salaries.)

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

In 1985 Idaho Power Co. received one rate increase and applied to the Commission for the largest increase ever submitted by a utility operating in Idaho.

The Boise-based firm, the state's largest electric utility with some 240,000 customers and serving most of southern Idaho, was allowed an increase of \$12.1 million, or 4.1 percent, in April for cogeneration expenses for contracts the past four years.

In September, Idaho Power filed its first general rate increase request since 1981. It asked the Commission to allow it to boost rates by \$84.2 million, or 27.4 percent.

The greatest portion of the increase, \$34.4 million, would be to cover Idaho's share in the second Valmy coal-fired generating unit. The northern Nevada unit went on line in May of 1985.

Public hearings also began on Idaho Power's application to lower the rate it pays for cogeneration or small power produced energy.

In the interim the Commission reduced the cogeneration rates on a 35-year contract from 6.78 to 4.42 cents per kilowatt hour. Idaho Power seeks to reduce the rates to 1.4 cents/kwh. No decision was rendered by the end of 1985.

The Commission complied with a ruling of the Idaho Supreme Court and granted Idaho Power a \$2.5 million annual rate increase. In July the court ruled the power supply model used by the IPUC in determining the company's 1982 rate orders overestimated the company's thermal resources by 10 percent.

Idaho Power also was recognized as the sole supplier of electrical energy for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in eastern Idaho. The Department of Energy sought the ruling, effective upon termination of a three-party contract between the federal agency, Idaho Power and Utah Power & Light Co.

IDAHO POWER COMPANY CASES:

COGENERATION COSTS GRANTED CASE NO. U-1006-248

In April Idaho Power was granted a \$12.1 million, 4.1 percent, rate increase to cover the expense of cogeneration contracts signed over the last four years.

Over the next three years, Idaho Power will be allowed to collect Idaho's share of the \$9.8 million it has spent on cogeneration so far. Including interest, the utility will collect \$4.7 million per year from ratepayers. In addition, Idaho Power was allowed to collect an additional \$8 million per year to cover its current ongoing cogeneration expenses.

The increase hiked residential rates per kilowatt hour from 3.9803 cents to 4.1435 cents.

Idaho Power had sought a total of \$20.8 million, which would have increased rates by seven percent the first year, but dropped after that to a level about 3.5 percent higher than current rates.

COGENERATION RATES TEMPORARILY REDUCED CASE NO. U-1006-248

Rates Idaho Power must pay for electricity produced by cogenerators and small power producers were temporarily reduced in May, but a company request to halt its obligation to buy the power was denied.

The temporary rate for standard 35-year contracts was set at 4.42 cents per kilowatt hour until the Commission completed public hearings on a request by the utility to reduce the rate to 1.4 cents/kwh. No decision was reached by the end of the year. Idaho Power's rates had been 6.78 cents/kwh.

In setting the interim rate, the Commission said there was a "substantial likelihood" that current rates for cogenerators, set in 1983, underestimated the magnitude of the Northwest's 1985 power surplus.

Future power surpluses are a critical element in calculating rates for cogenerators since the cogeneration rates are based not only on the utility's own planned power plants, but its access to cheap power on the market during surpluses.

The Commission found after its first hearing on Idaho Power's request that the utility made a good case "that its avoided costs during the current surplus in the Northwest and the projected duration of the surplus differ markedly from our estimates in the summer of 1983."

Commissioners observed that "in the fifteen years since Idaho Power first went beyond the watershed of the Snake River to obtain additional sources of electrical generation, it has not taken advantage of the wealth of electrical generating potential in the factories, farms, and canal drops of its ratepayers and their neighbors. In the seven years since PURPA was passed, the cogeneration and small power production industry has looked upon Idaho Power as an infinite sink for its production, but the industry has not broadened its horizons for sale outside of Idaho Power service territory. We are extremely disappointed that neither Idaho Power Company nor the cogeneration or small power production industry individually or together have ever presented this Commission with an orderly plan for acquiring and marketing the wealth of this state's renewable energy resources both within and without the state for the economic betterment of the Company, its shareholder, its ratepayers, cogenerators and small power producers, and the citizenry as a whole. This matter should not be a contest between the company and the industry."

PEBBLE CREEK SKI AREA TO PAY
CASE NO. U-1006-252

A ruling in July held that Pebble Creek Ski Area Limited of Inkom must pay Idaho Power \$5,450, the cost the utility incurred in the fall of 1984, when it removed two power poles from an area the ski company had cleared for a new ski run.

Idaho Power also re-routed the power lines at the ski area, located approximately 12 miles southeast of Pocatello.

In its complaint seeking reimbursement, the utility said the Caribou National Forest, which owns the land, had made removal of the above-ground poles a condition for Pebble Creek receiving a permit for the new ski slope.

The Commission held that the fact "Pebble Creek itself never specifically authorized Idaho Power to move the poles is not the controlling factor. We find that Pebble Creek, in developing and improving its land, forced Idaho Power to relocate the poles in question. We will not allow Pebble Creek to, at the expense of ratepayers, place Idaho Power in a class Catch-22 situation..."

SUPREME COURT ORDERS RATE INCREASE
CASE NO. U-1006-185-B

Complying with an Idaho Supreme Court ruling, the Commission in October granted Idaho Power a \$2.5 million annual rate increase.

The Court ruled that the power supply model used by the IPUC in determining Idaho Power's 1982 rate orders overestimated the company's thermal resources by 10 percent.

The formula adopted by the Commission allowed it to recognize Idaho Power's ability to use off-system sales, peak purchases and interruptible industrial sales in order to balance its load and resources. The Court, however, struck the IPUC findings.

While the Commission granted the increase, it noted that it had a continuing obligation to review the company's power supply modeling in all respects. Commissioners informed the company to provide modeling testimony during hearings on the utility's request for its \$84.2 million general rate increase.

GENERAL RATE INCREASE SOUGHT
CASE NO. U-1006-265

In September, Idaho Power applied for its first general rate increase since 1981 - an \$84.2 million, or 27.4 percent, hike. It was the largest increase ever sought by a utility operating in Idaho.

Commissioners began public hearings on the request in December.

The greatest portion of the increase, \$37.5 million, would be to pay Idaho Power's share of the Valmy II coal-fired generating plant in northern Nevada, which went on line in May of 1985. The Valmy amount represents 12.2 percent of the 27.4 percent proposed increase.

Other plant investments and increased operational costs are responsible for \$34.4 million and additional cogeneration expenses \$12.3 million.

Residential rates would increase from 4.2 cents to 5.3 cents per kilowatt hour. The company said this would mean an increase in the average residential rate of about \$13.78 per month.

The company said the boost in rates reflected increased costs the utility has experienced in general operation of its facilities and earnings on new investments.

Because of the many factors involved in the case, the Commission divided it into two phases. The first would determine revenue requirements. The second would determine final allocations of the revenue requirement among the customers classes.

Commissioners said "balancing of these factors together with administrative ease and convenience also favors making the rates collected between the first and second phases final and not subject to refund or surcharge."

SOLE PROVIDER OF POWER TO INEL
CASE NO. U-1500-157

In December, Idaho Power was recognized as the sole supplier of electrical energy for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory in eastern Idaho.

The Commission ruling was in response to a petition from the Department of Energy. The DOE had requested that upon termination of a three-party contract between the federal agency, Idaho Power and Utah Power & Light Co. that the Idaho utility, and not UP&L, supply the INEL's power and energy.

Commissioners noted that while both Idaho Power and UP&L are authorized to supply the area where the INEL is located, Idaho Power is providing the DOE "with its day in and day out energy and power requirements."

Since both companies have the legal right to serve the area, the Commission said, "we find that the utility that is currently and satisfactorily serving the disputed area may continue to do so.

"Idaho Power Company is the sole utility providing DOE with electrical power and energy."

Commissioners said another factor weighing in favor of their decision was the rates Idaho citizens must pay.

"To decide in favor of Utah would place an unnecessary and burdensome rate increase on not only Idaho Power's Idaho customers, but also on Utah Power and Light Company's Idaho customers," the Commission said.

For more Idaho Power information, see: Cogeneration and Consumer Issues.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Washington Water Power Company was actively engaged before the Commission with rate requests, lower cogeneration rates, natural gas rate decreases and the investigation of the company's nuclear power plant construction involvement.

Early in the year, Washington Water was authorized an 11 percent \$8.4 million rate hike, which was much less than the \$20 million, or 26 percent, it had requested the previous April.

The rate increase was granted primarily to offset WWP losses on the Skagit/Hanford nuclear plant and additional investment in Montana on Colstrip # 3 and #4 common facilities.

WWP, which serves some 66,000 northern Idaho customers, also had before the Commission an application to boost rates by \$13.2 million.

The Spokane, Wash.-based utility said it needed the majority of the additional revenue to cover the cost of its 15 percent share in the Montana Colstrip #4 coal-fired generating plant scheduled for completion in April of 1986.

In July, the Commission reactivated its investigation of WWP's investment in the delayed Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 nuclear plant and how much Idaho ratepayers should pay toward it.

A decision was reached as 1986 began and commissioners authorized WWP to amortize for its northern Idaho customers 60 percent of the Idaho share for the firm's investment costs in WPPSS-3 prior to 1982.

WWP was authorized to increase its rate for Idaho customers by approximately \$3.1 million to fund amortization over a 15-year period. This amount also recognized cessation of certain income tax deductions now flowed through to ratepayers.

Tracker decreases were authorized WWP for its natural gas customers as the utility's gas supplier, Northwest Pipeline, passed along reductions it was paying.

The company also had a request for a reduction in cogeneration rates its pays and an interim rate was granted pending a final determination following hearings in 1986.

Washington Water continued to provide the lowest residential electrical rates in the nation for customers served by investor-owned regulated electric utilities.

The cost of electricity for its residential customers was 3.35 cents per kilowatt hour while the nationwide average cost was 8.02 cents per kilowatt.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CASES

RATE INCREASE GRANTED CASE NO. U-1008-219

At the beginning of the year Washington Water Power Company was granted an \$8.4 million, or 11 percent rate increase.

Commissioners did not allow many of the expense increases requested by WWP, but they did allow many of the higher operating costs associated with new power plants: Colstrip No. 3 and Kettle Falls.

The Commission allowed WWP to recover \$8.58 million, or \$521,000 per year over a 15-year period, for expenses for the Skagit/Hanford nuclear plant, which was canceled in 1983. WWP had asked for \$17.8 million, or \$3.56 million each year in extra revenue from ratepayers over a five-year period.

The IPUC said it would not allow WWP to recover any expenses incurred after year-end 1981 and only half of its expenses incurred before that time. In December 1981 the Commission had told WWP it could no longer accumulate interest on the plant for future ratepayer responsibility.

"On the one hand, the company had reason to believe that it and its partners needed additional generation when planning for the Skagit/Hanford plant began," the Commission said. "Further, in the normal course of operating a utility, management would expect to incur licensing, environmental and engineering expenses in connection with planning for new generation. On the other hand, the consortium did not plan to build an 'off-the shelf' nuclear plant, but a new plant 25% larger than others then in operation. These two 1275-MW plants constituted more generation than all but one investor-owned utility in the region then owned. Furthermore, the consortium committed itself to substantial equipment costs before it even selected a site for the plant. And the consortium pursued the plant after it lost its initial site.

"These competing factors and others we could list could fill many more pages... However, they cannot be weighed against one another with mathematical precision. Instead, we exercise our judgment by finding that a 50/50 sharing of pre-1982 Skagit/Hanford costs between ratepayers and shareholders is a reasonable method of allocating this economic loss between the two groups."

NATURAL GAS RATES REDUCED
CASE NO. U 1008-235

Washington Water Power Company was authorized in June to lower its natural gas rates by \$390,000, or about one percent for most customers.

The rate reduction reflects a drop in WWP's wholesale gas prices.

The price per therm for residential customers, for example, will drop by about one-half cent, or by \$4.28 per year, for a typical customer using 800 therms per year.

WPPSS-3 INVESTIGATION REACTIVATED
CASE NO. U-1008-204

In July, an investigation of Washington Water Power's investment in the delayed Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 nuclear plant and the extent to which ratepayers in Idaho should be financially responsible for it was reactivated.

The federal Bonneville Power Administration, which owns 70 percent of the facility, decided in July 1983 to halt construction on the plant for financial reasons.

The delay prompted the Commission in November 1983 to open an investigation of Idaho ratepayer responsibility for the plant, especially if it were never completed.

Meanwhile, the four private utilities involved in the plant, including WWP, filed a lawsuit in federal district court seeking damages. In addition, WWP in October 1984 asked the IPUC for permission to recover nearly \$56 million as Idaho's share of the \$155 million it had spent, plus accumulated interest, on the project by the end of 1984.

Though public hearings were held on that proposal in December 1984, it was soon overshadowed by a January 1985 announcement that BPA and the four private utilities had reached a

settlement. The agreement would release WWP and the three other private utilities from involvement with the plant, but would require them to buy from the BPA, beginning in 1987, the amount of power equal to their original share in the plant.

In January 1985, the IPUC suspended its own investigation because it appeared that there would soon be a settlement between BPA and the privately-owned electric utilities, subject to the approval of a federal district judge.

Commissioners reactivated the case because too much time passed without a final settlement.

A final decision was pending at the end of 1985.

GENERAL RATE INCREASE FILED
CASE NO. U-1008-234

Washington Water Power filed an application in June for permission to increase its electrical rates for northern Idaho customers by \$13.6 million, or 16.8 percent.

WWP said the increase was needed to cover the costs of its 15 percent share in the Montana Colstrip No. 4 coal-fired plant, scheduled to be completed in April 1986.

The company also asked permission to increase its highest authorized return on common stock from 14.9 to 15.75 percent - a move that would increase the utility's allowable overall return from 12.097 to 12.5 percent.

WWP also argued it needed more revenue to cover some new investments and higher operating expenses.

Washington Water's request to included Colstrip No. 4 costs in rates represented \$9.52 million per year, or 70 percent of the proposed boost. The utility's request for revenue to cover new facilities and some higher operating expenses amounted to \$2.19 million annually, or 16 percent. The request for a higher rate of return amounted to an annual \$1.93 million, or 14 percent of the total increase.

No action had been taken as 1986 began.

NATURAL GAS RATES REDUCED \$90,000
CASE NO. U-1008-237

In September, Water Power was authorized a \$90,000 reduction in natural gas rates, reflecting a reduction in WWP's wholesale gas prices from its supplier, Northwest Pipeline Corp.

The rate reduction amounted to .181 cents per therm for WWP natural gas customers, except Potlatch Corp., and represented a yearly reduction of about \$1.45 for the average residential customer using 800 therms annually.

For Potlatch the reduction was .068 cents per therm. The Potlatch reduction was smaller for two reasons. First, no distribution losses were associated with serving Potlatch. Second, one of the reductions deferred for all other customers to Oct. 1 was not deferred for Potlatch because of its unique billing system.

COGENERATION COMPLAINT FILED
CASE NO. U-1008-241

Empire Lumber Company asked the Commission in September to require Washington Water Power to enter into a power sales agreement with the timber firm.

Empire, which operates a mill at Kamiah, said it sought to enter into a power sales agreement with WWP so a small power plant of less than 10,000 kilowatts could be located in the immediate vicinity of its plant.

The company said it attempted to negotiate a contract with WWP for over six months so the project could commence commercial deliveries about Aug. 1, 1987, and had relied upon the utility's assurances that a contract would be signed consistent with federal and state laws, but no contract was signed.

As the year ended, the Commission had the matter under advisement.

INTERVENOR MOTION DENIED
CASE NO. U-1008-234

Commissioners in October denied a motion to remove Washington Water Power's share of Colstrip No. 4 from the rate base in the firm's proposed \$13.6 million electrical rate hike.

The Committee for Fair Rates and Idaho Fair Share asked that Colstrip be dismissed from the proceedings. They argued the Commission could not as "a matter of law consider inclusion of the non-operating plant in the case."

They contended Colstrip No. 4 in Montana would not be fully operational until April 1986 and therefore under Idaho law could not be considered until that time.

Denying the motion, the Commission said the action of the two intervenors was "premature."

The Commission said it was constrained by two sections of the Idaho Code. One section allows for a seven month statute of limitations in which the Commission acts and the other restricts inclusion of electric power plants in rate cases until they are producing.

Commissioners said they intended to comply with the time constraints of the Code and at the decision portion of the proceedings they would consider requirements imposed upon them by the other section of the code, emphasizing "our intent to comply with its mandates as well."

THIRD NATURAL GAS REDUCTION GRANTED CASE NO. U-1008-243

In October, Washington Water Power was granted its third natural gas reduction as a result of a reduction passed on by its supplier, Northwest Pipeline.

The reduction amounted to \$1,398,000, or 4.4 percent, for a yearly residential decline of \$15.36. Because of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission action in November, the rate reduction was reduced.

The final reduction authorized for WWP customers was \$1,031,000, or 3.2 percent, which provided an \$11.33 decline in the yearly charges for residential customers.

For more Washington Water Power information, see: Cogeneration and Consumer Issues.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

Utah Power & Light Company received one rate increase, filed for another rate hike and closed the books on another during 1985. It also was ruled against as an energy supplier for the National Engineering Laboratory in eastern Idaho.

In late February the Utah utility was granted a \$1.8 million, 1.82 percent overall revenue increase -- a move increasing residential rates by an average 3.5 percent.

The rate hike that was granted resulted from lowered energy credits from the federal Bonneville Power Administration and additional funds the Commission allowed from a rehearing on a previous rate case.

But in September UP&L was back before the Commission with a request for a general rate increase of \$14.2, or 11.2 percent, in its electrical charges for its eastern Idaho customers.

Utah Power & Light, seeking its first general increase since December 1983, said the rate hike was necessary to bring its rates more closely in line with the costs of providing service.

If approved by the Commission, sometime in 1986, rates for UP&L's Idaho customers would increase \$3 to \$10 a month for a typical household, depending on how much electricity is used.

In April UP&L's request to include in its Idaho electric rates the cost of canceling its Hunter No. 4 coal-fired plant was formally closed after the company announced it would write off the \$60 million loss against its 1984 earnings.

Utah Power also was ordered during the year to sign a contract with Beker Industries Corp., an eastern Idaho phosphate processing company, for the purchase of cogeneration power in connection with a new Beker sulfuric acid plant.

Beker had filed a complaint with the IPUC, alleging that UP&L was unwilling to negotiate a contract.

UP&L's Idaho customers received a slight rate increase during 1985 as a result of final adoption of a standard rate base allocation method for its jurisdictions in three states. A change in BPA energy credits also resulted in a slight increase in residential charges and a small decrease for irrigation customers.

UTAH POWER & LIGHT CASES:

DOE FAVORS IDAHO POWER
CASE NO. U-1500-157

(SEE IDAHO POWER COMPANY)

RATE INCREASE GRANTED
CASE NO. U-1009 137

A \$1.8 million, 1.82 percent overall revenue increase was authorized for Utah Power & Light in February.

The increase was caused by some \$1.5 million in lowered energy credits from the Bonneville Power Administration and about \$300,000 per year extra the Commission decided to allow UP&L from a rehearing on its last rate case.

UP&L had claimed that BPA funding fell short some \$800,000 and the Commission allowed the company to recover these losses as well as granted another \$700,000 per year to account for the federal agency's new and lower energy credit.

The Commission also allowed UP&L an extra \$318,000 per year as the result of its decision to accept part of a rehearing argument the firm made in the wake of a rate case decision the IPUC made in 1984.

BEKER CONTRACT ORDERED SIGNED
CASE NO. U-1009-150

On Jan. 30 Beker Industries Corp. filed a complaint charging Utah Power & Light with failure to sign a cogeneration contract and on March 7 the Commission ordered utility compliance to negotiate a contract.

Beker, an eastern Idaho phosphate processing company, alleged it was unable to arrive at a contract agreement with UP&L for the purchase of power from a cogeneration facility the firm was planning to construct in conjunction with a new sulfuric acid plant.

In its order, the Commission said the contract must be for at least 30 years and that UP&L's payments to Beker must start at an average of about 4.7 cents per kilowatt hour.

The IPUC said the rate assumed Beker's plant would have an average capacity of 26 megawatts and that it would be in operation at least 350 days per year. The rate would be reduced if Beker was unable to deliver this amount of power.

Beker planned to replace two aging sulfuric acid plants at its Conda facility just northeast of Soda Springs. The new plant would produce 2,500 tons of sulphuric acid per day and generate waste heat, whereby cogeneration power would provide revenues the company estimated would make its operation more competitive.

HUNTER NO. 4 BOOKS FORMALLY CLOSED
CASE NO. U-1009-148

A Utah Power & Light request to include in its Idaho electric rates the cost of canceling its Hunter No. 4 coal-fired plant was formally closed in April after the firm decided to write off the \$60 million loss against its 1984 earnings.

In the fall of 1984 the company decided not to build the \$700 million unit due to slowed growth in the demand for energy. UP&L petitioned the IPUC for permission to charge Idaho's portion of the loss to ratepayers over a five-year period.

It later was decided by the Salt Lake City-based company not to seek rate increases to recover the utility's losses and the Commission subsequently dismissed the case.

BPA ENERGY CREDIT CHANGE
CASE NO. U-1009-158

A Bonneville Power Administration energy credits change for Utah Power & Light customers in July resulted in a decrease in irrigation rates and a slight increase in residential rates.

Commission approval of the new rates to reflect the BPA change resulted in an increase in summer residential UP&L electric rates of 2.3 percent, from 6.8251 to 6.9831 cents per kilowatt hour.

The rate for a customer using 1,000 kilowatt hours per month for lights, appliances and water heating increased \$1.58 per month, up from \$68.25 to \$69.83.

Irrigation rates dropped by .37 cents per kilowatt hour for the April-August irrigation season. Irrigation customers also pay other UP&L charges, however, so the percentage decrease for these ratepayers varied.

GENERAL RATE HIKE REQUESTED
CASE NO. U-1009-157

In September, Utah Power & Light applied for a \$14.2 million, 11.2 percent, general rate increase for its eastern Idaho electric customers.

In its first rate filing since December 1983, UP&L said the additional revenue was needed from its Idaho service area to bring rates more closely in line with the costs of providing service.

UP&L said an increase in the Bonneville Power Administration credit would offset about \$4.2 million of the increase, producing a net increase of 9.6 percent.

The company said since its last rate filing it had seen increases in the costs of the weatherization program and in the costs of attracting investment money to upgrade and expand the system and a new means of determining Idaho's fair share of UP&L's total system has produced an increase of about \$2.8 million.

STANDARD RATE BASE ALLOCATION METHOD ADOPTED

Final adoption of a standard rate base allocation method for Utah Power & Light's jurisdiction in three states in December resulted in a slight increase in electrical rates for the firm's electrical customers.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission with jurisdiction over private utility sales to municipal electric services was the last to adopt the agreed upon allocation method. The method previously had been adopted by public utility commissions of Utah, Idaho and Wyoming.

The new method boosted UP&L's total Idaho revenues \$3 million, reduced to \$1.6 million after a Bonneville Power Administration credit adjustments.

For more Utah Power & Light information, see: Cogeneration and Consumer Issues.

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Citizens Utilities Company in June filed its first rate increase request since receiving a 2.2 percent hike in electric rates and a 9.2 water rate boost in March 1983.

The Stamford, Conn., utility, which serves some 2,500 customers in the northern Idaho communities of Wallace, Silverton, Mullan and Burke, applied for a \$268,638 increase.

Citizens asked for an overall rate return of 13.23 percent. That represented a 15.8 percent increase over existing rates.

The rate increase, which the company said was needed to realize a fair return on its property, would be spread across the board among all of its customers. Monthly rates for residential customers would go from 3.8 cents to 4.49 cents per kilowatt hour.

Citizens also asked for authority to raise charges for reconnection and meter testing. Reconnections during normal work hours would increase from \$5 to \$15 and from \$5 to \$30 during other hours, while meter testing would raise from \$1 to \$15.

The company purchases all power to serve its Idaho customers from the Washington Water Power Company.

A Commission decision was expected early in 1986.

PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

Pacific Power & Light Company, a Portland, Ore.-based utility serving more than 9,000 customers in the Sandpoint and Priest River areas, was granted two rate increases in 1985. Both increases were less than requested by the company.

In January the Commission authorized an \$884,000, 9.2 percent rate increase, largely to cover the higher cost of power resulting from a contract phase-out between PP&L and Washington Water Power Company. Pacific Power had requested an approximate \$1.2 million, 12 percent boost.

WWP received Federal Energy Regulatory Commission approval in 1981 to phase-out a long-standing program through which PP&L purchased wholesale from WWP all of the power needed to supply its Idaho customers.

In May Pacific Power returned to the Commission for a \$1,491,000, 12.9 rate hike. The company asserted the increase was needed because of hikes in operating expenses, rate base, depreciation expense and taxes other than income tax expense as well as phase-out of the WWP contract.

Authorizing only \$680,000, or 5.91 percent, in December, commissioners noted the phase-out was moot since Pacific and WWP, with encouragement of the Commission, had negotiated an extension of the contract.

The Commission also authorized Pacific to pass through to residential and small irrigation customers a \$235,000 rate reduction resulting from increased Bonneville Power Administration energy credits.

In June, the Commission approved an upgraded weatherization program Pacific was ordered in January to provide its residential and commercial customers.

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY CASES:

HIGHER RATES ALLOWED
CASE NO. U-1046-136

An \$884,000, 9.2 percent rate increase was authorized Pacific Power & Light in January. The increase largely covered the higher cost of power resulting from a contract phase-out between Pacific and Washington Water Power Company.

Residential rates were increased 7.9 percent, although the rate hike was slightly offset by an increased energy credit from the Bonneville Power Administration. A residential customer using 1,000 kilowatt hours per month experienced an increase from \$44.18 to \$47.69.

PP&L had applied to the Commission for an approximate \$1.2 million, 12 percent rate hike. Approximately two-thirds of the request was due to a reduction in the amount of relatively low-cost purchased power available to Pacific through its contract with WWP, which since 1982 gradually has been replaced with PP&L's own, more expensive power.

RATE REDUCTION APPROVED
CASE NO. U-1046-147

In June Pacific was authorized to pass through to residential and irrigation customers a substantial increase in benefits from the Bonneville Power Administration, resulting in a drop in rates by an average \$235,000, or 2.3 percent.

Residential customers using 1,000 kilowatt hours per month benefit from a \$2.27 monthly reduction in their bills.

Small irrigation pumping customers received the same benefits, plus extra discounts from April through August.

Before the energy credit change, PP&L charged residential customers 4.769 cents per kilowatt hour: 6.193 cents/kwh (PP&L's charge) minus 1.424 cents/kwh (BPA's energy credit).

With the new benefits, the residential rates were 4.6542 cents/kwh: 6.193 cents/kwh (PP&L's charge) minus 1.651 cents/kwh (BPA's energy credit).

UPGRADED WEATHERIZATION PROGRAM
CASE NO. U-1046-145

An upgraded weatherization program ordered Pacific in January for residential and commercial customers was approved in June.

For residential customers, PP&L provides several new offerings. They include a "blitz" conservation program where ratepayers are given home weatherization and energy audit kits, \$50 cash rebates for purchasing efficient electric water heaters, a Good Cents home program, and new standards that allow customers with wood stoves to qualify for zero-interest weatherization loans.

For the last several years, Pacific has offered zero-interest loans for floor and ceiling insulation, storm doors and windows, double glazing, duct wrapping, timed thermostats and water heater insulation blankets as long as they met the cost-effectiveness criteria of the IPUC.

Now, the company also offers conservation workshops throughout its Idaho service area where customers are taught how to perform energy audits on their homes and how to perform many weatherization measures with materials provided at no charge by PP&L.

Pacific also changed the way it qualifies homes for weatherization funding by allowing into the program homes that do not appear to be high energy users simply because the owner has a supplemental heat source, such as a wood stove.

The company also offers a "Good Cents" home program that recognizes new homes that meet energy-efficient building standards and use far less electricity than regular houses.

The upgraded program provides \$50 cash rebates to customers who install new 40-120 gallon electric hot water heaters meeting energy-efficient standards.

Pacific's commercial energy-savings program provides for improved energy audits and increased business awareness of their availability.

Level-pay plans are being offered by the company for seasonal businesses. Level-pay averages electricity bills over the year so the customer pays the same amount each month.

RATE HIKE CASE NO. U-1046-144

In May, Pacific applied to the Commission for a \$1.5 million, or 12.9 percent rate increase.

Pacific said the boost was needed because of increases in operating expenses, rate base, depreciation expenses and taxes other than income tax expenses as well as phase-out of a contract with Washington Water Power for lower cost power.

In December, the Commission issued its decision to allow Pacific an increase of \$680,000, or 5.91 percent.

As a result of those negotiations, Pacific will continue purchasing five megawatts of lower-cost, firm power to help meet a portion of its Idaho energy requirement, thus reducing the proposed revenue deficiency from \$1,491,000 to \$1,051,000.

Including the average ratebase, the extension of the WWP contract and assuming acceptance of various other adjustments, the Commission staff proposed an additional revenue requirement of \$716,000.

Commissioners accepted the \$716,000 additional revenue requirement and further reduced it to account for a reduction in the cost of capital, which related to a reduction of \$36,000 for a final \$680,000 rate hike.

Pacific had arrived at an estimated range of cost of capital at 14.8 to 16.5 percent with a point of estimate of 16 percent. The Commission settled on a cost of capital of 14 percent, which was the lower end of the range recommended by the Commission staff.

Commissioners accepted a staff recommendation to reject the company's year-end rate base because it "inadequately matches revenues, expenses and rate base."

A staff proposal for average-year rate base was adopted. The Commission said it adopted the average-year rate base because Pacific is not experiencing the rapid growth that it experienced in the 1970's nor is it suffering the effects of the double-digit inflation of the early 1980's.

ATLANTA POWER COMPANY

Idaho gained a new electrical utility during 1985. Atlanta Power Company filed an application with the Commission in December to serve customers in an approximate 600-square-mile area of Boise, Camas, Blaine and Elmore counties.

Late in the fall, Lynn Stevenson of Bliss and Lee Barron of Fairfield, refurbished the generating plant at Atlanta, which is located on the headwaters of the Middle Fork of the Boise River, and began service to the community's 50 residents.

The power plant had burned down five years previous and residents of the community had been limited to power on an eight hours per day basis from an auxiliary generator.

SWAN FALLS WATER RIGHTS AGREEMENT

Idaho Power Company's petition asking the Commission to become involved as to the public interest in the Swan Falls water rights agreement became a moot issue in 1985.

In November of 1984, the utility asked the Commission to declare the agreement in the public interest - a month after an agreement was signed by the company and the state. Idaho Power also wanted an IPUC order that would shield the company from damages if a future Commission or court found that the agreement resulted in the abandonment of valuable Idaho Power water rights.

Idaho Power and the state signed an agreement to resolve a long-standing dispute over how the Snake River's water should be used, especially in future years. Primarily of concern was the generation of inexpensive power at Idaho Power's hydroelectric facilities and continued upstream irrigation development.

The Swan Falls agreement eventually was reached and signed and the 1985 Legislature responded favorably to the transaction.

As a result of the legislative action, the Commission no longer had jurisdiction in a complaint that Idaho Power was promoting Snake River diversions and therefore was failing to protect its water rights at Swan Falls.

"The Legislature has by statute provided Idaho Power Company with the rulings the Company requested this Commission to give it by Order," commissioners said in April. "This Commission has no jurisdiction or authority to modify, qualify, ratify, or approve legislation; this Commission is subordinate to statute, not vice versa. Idaho Power's petition for a declaratory Order will therefore be dismissed on the ground that the Legislature itself has already settled the issues that the Company requested this Commission to consider."

The agreement approved by the 1985 Legislature would increase the minimum streamflow at the dam from 3,300 cubic feet per second (in the summer, during the lowest streamflow year) to 3,900 cfs - a move that makes 600 cfs of additional flow available to Idaho Power at its huge Hells Canyon dam complex downstream from the Swan Falls Dam.

COGENERATION AND SMALL POWER PRODUCTION

A one-year moratorium on cogeneration and small power production purchases in areas served by the Bonneville Power Administration was imposed by the Commission, which also began tackling the problem of setting rates for independently-produced power purchases.

In February, commissioners decided for one year they would allow Idaho's private electric utilities to refuse power from future independent power producers who develop projects in areas served by BPA.

When the Commission issued its order, BPA's cogeneration rate was so low that small power producers located in the service area of BPA-served towns and cooperatives wheel their power from those areas and hook up with private electric utilities offering higher, IPUC-authorized rates.

The Commission said private utilities and their customers are, therefore, acquiring and paying for all of the available cogeneration and small power in Idaho. The BPA and its customers are not sharing in the cost.

Commissioners said the moratorium would not apply to projects located in remote areas where it was unclear what utility serves, if any.

The IPUC said it found there were other projects underway in BPA-served areas, but decided that the one-year moratorium would mean investments would not be lost.

Cogenerators are individuals or companies that develop their own power projects, such as small hyroelectric facilities, or systems that produce electricity from waste heat at manufacturing plants.

Privately owned electric utilities, such as Idaho Power Company, Washington Water Power Company and Utah Power & Light Company, are required by the 1978 National Energy Act to buy power from such projects, at rates set by state regulatory commissions. Federal power marketing agencies, such as the BPA, also are required to buy power, but they set the rates themselves.

"The Bonneville Power Administration has defied and frustrated the congressional intent to encourage connection of cogenerators and small power producers to the nation's electric

grid by its refusal to offer to purchase from these producers at its own avoided costs," the Commission said. "The result has been that in Idaho, qualifying cogenerators and small power producers with projects in the service territory of utilities with firm-purchase contracts repeatedly seek to wheel their output to investor-owned utilities regulated by this Commission."

The IPUC said the BPA, therefore, was relieving itself of its statutory duty to purchase cogeneration, or independently-produced power.

Public hearings were started in the spring on an application by Idaho Power Company to drastically reduce the rate it pays for electricity produced by cogenerators and small power producers. The company wants the rates reduced to 1.4 cents per kilowatt hour.

In May, the Commission temporarily dropped the Idaho Power rates from 6.78 to 4.42 cents/kwh on 35-year contracts until hearings were completed and a final decision was reached. No final decision was reached by the end of the year.

Idaho's other major electric utilities also joined Idaho Power in seeking reduced rates. They argued that avoided costs during the current energy surplus in the Northwest and the projected duration of that surplus differ markedly from estimates made when current cogeneration rates were last set by the IPUC.

Commissioners are expected to reach a decision on the cogeneration rate cases sometime in 1986.

The IPUC also asked Idaho Power, Utah Power and Pacific Power & Light Company the question of multiple rate options for cogenerators and small power producers.

The single rate option has proven easy to administer, but it neither tracks the fixed capital nor operating costs of a typical hydroelectric or thermal facility..

The Commission asked the utilities to consider at least two options for structuring rates. First, in the case of hydro plants, all or nearly all rates are fixed over the course of the contract and they are subject to little or no change. Second, a small portion of the rate for a thermal plant is fixed over the life of a contract while a larger portion changes as the utility's fuel costs change.

Several complaints by cogenerators and small power producers were considered by the Commission during the year and several orders were issued directing utilities to enter into contracts.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Intermountain Gas Company customers saw a steady decline in their rates during 1985 as the utility passed along reductions from its supplier, Northwest Pipeline Corporation.

These reductions amounted to \$13.5 million. For the residential customers using 90 therms of natural gas, the decreases totaled nearly \$5 in monthly rates, declining from \$60.85 to \$55.90.

Rates paid by Intermountain's 99,000 southern Idaho customers by the end of the year were the lowest since 1982 levels.

Intermountain filed for its first general rate increase since the company received a \$5.5 million boost in November 1982. Since the last increase, the company said it experienced an approximate 20 percent increase in operating, maintenance, taxes and depreciation expenses.

To offset these rising expenses, Intermountain filed for a \$2.8 million, or 2.9 percent, increase, which was denied by the Commission. A motion for reconsideration also was rejected.

In August, the Commission authorized the company to defer certain gas cost reductions and to implement a new seasonal incremental tariff on a short term basis. As a result of this order, two major processing companies operating in Idaho immediately switched to natural gas.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CASES:

LARGE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMER RATES LOWERED CASE NO. U-1034-117

In January, Intermountain was authorized to pass on a \$605,000 November wholesale cost saving to its large industrial customers, but residential and commercial would not be raised.

The move lowered large volume industrial rates by one-half cent per therm, which reduced the company's total revenues from those customers by 1.1 percent.

In October 1984 Intermountain proposed to slightly increase residential and commercial natural gas rates and offer an even more substantial 2.21 percent average decrease to its industrial customers.

It was an attempt by Intermountain officials to develop more attractive gas rates for large industrial customers and to retrieve large customers contracting with out-of-state firms offering lower rates. The company also wanted to prevent further industrial defections either to other gas companies, or to other fuels, such as coal.

The gas company argued and the Commission agreed that rates for all ratepayers eventually will drop if Intermountain could retain its large customers and attract new business.

MORTGAGE BOND SALE APPROVED
CASE NO. U-1034-120

Intermountain was authorized to issue and sell \$15 million in First Mortgage Bonds, the proceeds from which would be used to begin paying off a \$40 million loan four investors obtained to finance their September 1984 takeover of the utility.

The Commission ruled, however, the utility would be prohibited from applying for any future rate increase related to the transaction.

In its order, the IPUC said any cash flow problems that may result would be the risk of the company's four shareholders, not ratepayers.

In addition, the Commission said the next time it must figure Intermountain's allowable rate of return (in the next general rate case), it would take into account the change in the company's capital structure - or mix of stocks and bonds. The IPUC said it would assume the company's equity - or common stock - had dropped by \$10 million and that its debt increased by \$15 million.

That move may lower the company's overall rate of return because equity usually commands a higher return than a utility's debt. However, the company's increased debt obligation may increase its risk.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS REQUEST
CASE NO. U-1034-122

Intermountain's request for an approximate \$2.8 million rate increase was denied in December 1985.

The Commission's calculation of Intermountain's fair rate level actually showed that rates should be reduced by a fraction of

one percent. The reduction was not ordered by the Commission, however, because commissioners felt the company's total revenues collected under current rates were nearly the same as those calculated by the IPUC order.

In seeking the rate hike, Intermountain proposed increasing commercial and residential charges while lowering its industrial rates.

"We note that, increasingly, the burden of cost-of-service is spread to those customers who are captive to the system in order to prevent the large volume users going off the system and increasing the overall burden of other ratepayers," the Commission said.

The case also provided the Commission with its first occasion to consider an application for intervenor funding under a new statute. In setting guidelines for its interpretation, the commissioners said approval of the intervenor funds "is not based on a win or lose situation.

"The question to be answered is whether the testimony materially contributed to the understanding of the issues addressed by that testimony and the decision finally reached. Clearly, in this case the answer must be affirmative."

The Commission reduced by more than \$2,000 the intervenor funding sought by the Idaho Citizen's Coalition. It allowed the Coalition to recover \$9,003 in costs and expenses.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Issues ranging from telephone access charges to providing better and cheaper services for the state's phone customers dominated Idaho Public Utilities Commission telecommunications activities in 1985.

It was a continuing saga of the problems that were created by the divestiture of AT&T, which resulted in the 22 Bell operating companies becoming separate entities and the federal government changing the way they were financially supported.

Throughout the year, the Commission dealt with telephone services to reduce the cost to users and still provide a fair return to the phone companies.

The Idaho Commission finally was forced to forsake its three-year battle against the FCC's subscriber line charge and allow Mountain Bell to collect the \$1 monthly toll charge from all customers, whether or not they made long-distance calls.

Commissioners said they recognized that "all Mountain Bell customers would be burdened by the additional costs of a billing alternative."

As the year ended, the IPUC established what it concluded was the fairest way to divide total Idaho telephone facility costs between local and long-distance companies profiting from them.

The plan allocates telephone company costs that do not vary with usage. Twenty-five percent of the costs would be allocated for out-of-state tolls, 25 percent for in-state tolls and 50 percent for local exchange.

Commission action was in compliance with an FCC order adopting a 25 percent allocation factor. The federal agency ordered certain costs presently allocated to out-of state service be transferred to the state jurisdiction.

During 1985, the Commission also authorized toll-free calling for a number of areas, ordered new types of services resulting in reduced rates, pay phone ownership for private businesses or individuals and consumer protection from automatic telephone solicitation.

As a result of joint public hearings between the IPUC and the Idaho Commission's counterpart in Washington State, both regulatory bodies ordered General Telephone Company to

implement toll-free calling between Moscow and Pullman, Wash.
-- a service effective June 1986.

Commission orders provided METRO-PAC reduced fare calling for a number of Idaho cities and the independent pay telephone service was ordered in June, provided there was compliance with Commission consumer protection guidelines.

Consumer protection also was provided by the Commission when it issued an order limiting dialing devices to those that free the line as soon as the customer hangs up and restricts such calls to between 9 a.m. and 9 p.m.

In another customer move, the Commission prohibited Pacific Northwest Bell from charging customers 25 cents for each time-of-day announcement phone calls. In mid-1984, Pacific Northwest had contracted with Tel-Time, a private company, to offer time-of-day service to Pacific's Idaho customers.

The Idaho action, prohibiting a customer charge for time-of-day, since has been upheld by the FCC.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL

AT&T divestiture continued to play a major role in Commission activities with regard to Mountain Bell during 1985 -- a year that saw commissioners order new types of services, tackle access problems and change rural zone charges.

A mix of rate increases and reductions provided the utility with an increase of \$4.2 million in annual revenue. Commissioners also granted the company a \$3.1 million Idaho interim in-state depreciation increase. A final decision had not been reached on the increase at the end of the year.

As a result of Commission orders, many communities in 1985 were offered METROPAC telephone service, which allowed customers to make calls between certain cities and towns at reduced rates.

Mountain Bell also was ordered by the Commission not to charge customers who didn't make long-distance calls the \$1 subscriber line charge. The Federal Communications Commission, however, overruled the Idaho regulatory body, which then directed Mountain Bell to provide an alternative billing system to carry out the directions of the IPUC. A decision still was pending as 1986 began.

During 1985, Mountain Bell's one-party residential rates rose from \$9.43-\$11.91 range to the \$10.01-\$12.28 range, depending on the exchange.

One-party business rates increased from the \$23.64-\$29.79 range to the \$25.15-\$30.77 range.

Mountain Bell had 307,000 access lines serving Idaho during 1985.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL CASES

\$1 SUBSCRIBER LINE CHARGE CASE NO. U-1000-63

In May, the Commission was forced by federal decisions to delay dropping Mountain Bell's residential and single-line business rates by \$1 for customers not making out-of-state long-distance calls in any one month.

The Commission, an outspoken critic of the fee since its inception, had said that such customers should not be charged.

but the Federal Communications Commission ruled in an Iowa case that all local phone companies must collect the \$1 fee.

The Commission issued a subsequent clarifying order saying Mountain Bell would collect the FCC-ordered charge on each bill and simply lower its rate for local service by \$1 for those not making interstate long-distance calls in the month.

Mountain Bell petitioned the Commission for permission to delay the reduction for those customers not making out of state calls until the legal difficulties surrounding the conflicting state and federal orders were resolved.

Idaho's commissioners agreed and the case was unresolved at the start of 1986.

METROPAC SERVICE APPROVED
CASE NOS. U-1000-67/73/76/81

A new optional discount long-distance calling package called METROPAC was approved in July for Mountain Bell customers in Eden-Hazelton, Twin Falls, Bliss, Buhl, Castleford, Dietrich, Gooding, Hagerman, Jerome, Kimberly, McCammon, Murtaugh, Shoshone and Wendell.

The Commission action was in response to a 1983 petition from residents and businesses in Eden-Hazelton who wanted so-called Extended Area Service (EAS), or toll-free calling from Twin Falls and other Magic Valley locations.

If EAS had been granted, all customers would have been required to pay an extra monthly charge for the toll-free calling and would have been "an unfair burden" to Eden-Hazelton customers who do not make many calls within the Magic Valley.

Eden-Hazelton was granted an improved optional long-distance calling package called METROPAC that reduced by about 36 percent the regular rate for calls between specifically approved communities within 40 miles of each other. The new program replaced another METROPAC plan available in several Magic Valley Mountain Bell exchanges since 1968.

Unlike the old METROPAC plan, the new plan gave large discounts for evening and late night-weekend calls. It also charged less for short-distance calls.

RATE INCREASE SOUGHT
CASE NO. U-1000-82

Mountain Bell asked the Commission in July for a \$3.1 million, 2.94 percent increase it said was needed to depreciate the value of its equipment and facilities over a shorter period of time.

Most of the proposed increase would be collected through a 2.94 percent boost in basic monthly rates, toll and many other services. In addition, Bell has proposed to reduce the number of free directory assistance calls from five to two per month. The utility also proposed to increase the charge for additional directory calls from 27 to 30 cents and the operator-handled directory assistance rate from 54 to 60 cents.

In addition, the per line residential rate for touch tone phones would be increased from 59 cents to \$1 per month and the per line business rate for touch tone would go from \$1.91 to \$3 per month. Business trunk line rates would be reduced from \$5.15 to \$3 per month.

An interim \$3.1 million increase was authorized by the Commission in September with final action to be taken in 1986.

ADDITIONAL METROPAC AUTHORIZED
CASE NO. U-1000-81

The Commission authorized Mountain Bell in October to provide METROPAC discounted toll service to Downey, Lava Hot Springs and Inkom customers.

At the same time, the Commission ordered Mountain Bell to install special foreign exchange circuits and coin phones to allow schools access to the exchanges of Lava, Downey, McCammon and the Inkom portion of the Pocatello exchange for a 25 cents coin call.

The METROPAC service amounted to an approximate 37 percent discount, depending on the mileage and time-of-day. Charges weekdays between 5 p.m. and 11 p.m. were discounted an additional 40 percent and between 11 p.m. and 8 a.m. and on weekends were reduced an additional 60 percent.

EMMETT METROPAC
CASE NO. U-1000-76

In July, the Commission directed Mountain Bell to implement a discount long distance METROPAC service for calls between Emmett and Boise.

Under the METROPAC plan, the rate for a five minute call from Emmett to Boise was decreased from \$1.15 to 72 cents. It was a 37 percent discount subject to additional discounts in the event calls were made during weekend or evening hours.

Emmett resident Dale Cooper petitioned the Commission to reconsider its decision and provide toll-free calling, claiming the METROPAC service was not responsive to Emmett caller's needs. Commissioners, however, denied the request.

BULK LEASING
CASE NO. U-1000-80

Mountain Bell was granted authority in June a trial run at leasing local telephone lines in bulk to groups of businesses or residents. It allowed groups of customers in the same building or area the option of privately arranging their own billing and phone services. Mountain Bell provided only the necessary lines to the building. Commissioners said the trial run would be examined in 1986.

GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE NORTHWEST

General Telephone came in for its first major rate increase since 1983 during the 1985 period.

The Everett, Wash.-based telephone company, which provides service to some 60,000-plus northern Idaho customers, asked the Commission for permission to raise its rates \$1.4 million.

During 1985, the Commission issued orders that settled three cases that were pending from 1984. The orders resolved the Tekoa-Tensed Discount Calling, Moscow-Pullman Extended Area Calling (EAS) and Rathdrum EAS.

In addition, the Commission started proceedings on further EAS in General's service area as well as an investigation into the utility's line extension practices.

GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY CASES:

TEKOA/TENSED DISCOUNT CALLING CASE NO. U-1002-52

In September, the Commission approved a plan to offer discount long-distance service from the Idaho-Washington border community of Tensed to the Moscow, St. Maries and Plummer/Worley exchanges of General Telephone.

The service had been requested by residents of Tensed in 1984. The Idaho Commission wanted to approve the cheaper rates in October of 1984, but were required to first obtain a federal waiver of a legal technicality buried in a massive AT&T divestiture agreement establishing geographical boundaries called LATAs.

The Tekoa exchange is in the Pacific Northwest Bell's Spokane LATA while the other communities are in General's LATA. A federal judge signed a waiver to allow service between the Tensed portion of the PNB exchange and the General communities to which the IPUC allowed discount long-distant calling.

The Commission authorized calling charges to be measured in units. During peak hours of 8 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays other than holidays, one minute of calling generates two units for charging purposes. During all other times, one minute of calling generates one unit for charging purposes.

TEKOA exchange customers were allowed to subscribe to one of the following options:

OPTION	RANGE	MINIMUM CHARGE	ADDITIONAL CHARGES
1A	32 miles	\$5 for 150 units	\$.04 per unit
1B	32 miles	\$7 for 210 units	\$.04 per unit
2	40 miles	\$7 for 120 units	\$.07 per unit

RATHDRUM/COEUR D'ALENE EAS
CASE NO. U-1002-54

The Commission in May changed General's optional discount long-distance calling package for calls within the Rathdrum Prairie area and to Coeur d'Alene.

The package provided cheaper service for customers who make most calls in the evening and on weekends.

Commission action was in response to an August 1984 petition from customers in Post Falls, Rathdrum, Spirit Lake, Bayview and Hayden Lake who had complained that calls between those communities and to Coeur d'Alene should not be long-distance, but toll-free calls.

The Extended Area Service (EAS), or toll-free service, was rejected by the Commission, which found it would boost basic rates for other General customers, including those not benefiting from the new program. More phone lines would have been required and the company would have had a significant drop in long-distance revenue.

But the commissioners ordered the phone company to offer a toll-free plan to all schools in the Rathdrum area's Lakeland School District, which draws students from all five exchanges.

The new call-PAC service ordered by the Commission allowed customers to purchase 210 units of calling for \$7 per month. One minute of calling during peaks between 8 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays, excluding holidays, will be two units. One minute of calling on off-peak hours will be one unit. All additional units in the month cost four cents per unit.

The plan provides cheaper service for customers who do most of their calling in off-peak hours, but costs more for customers who make many calls on peak hours.

LINE EXTENSION PRACTICE INVESTIGATION
CASE NO. U-1002-58

An investigation was commenced by the Commission in October into General's line extension practices as a result of a letter to the Idaho Attorney General from a Sandpoint contractor.

Dennis Warren alleged that in 1982 the company was asking a price of 75 cents a foot after an initial 250 feet of free line extension. A year later, he said, General offered 660 feet of free line extension and 25 cents a foot thereafter.

The Commission said its investigation would determine whether General changed the interpretation of its line extension tariff without permission; if so, did the interpretation violate the company's tariff; if so, were customers overcharged in violation of the tariff and is payment due customers.

RATE INCREASE REQUESTED
CASE NO. U-1002-59

In October, General requested a \$1.8 million rate increase to offset a Federal Communications Commission order changing allocation of plant investment from the federal to state jurisdiction and because of revised FCC depreciation rates.

This request later was reduced to \$1.4 million after the telephone company discovered a \$444,643 calculation error.

General said the increases would be recovered from several telephone services. Besides increases in the network access rates, the company proposes revenue boosts from changes in nonrecurring charges, such as the initial charge for telephone installation, directory assistance charges, nonlisted service rates and nonpublished service rates.

Public hearings on the rate request were scheduled for 1986.

HOPE-CLARK FORK EAS
CASE NO. U-1002-60

Petitions were submitted to the Commission in October seeking toll-free telephone service between Hope and Clark Fork.

The petitions contended that not only did lack of such service "create a hardship financially on our combined communities, but it seems ludicrous that a distance of only eight miles should determine a long distance charge."

A public hearing into the case was scheduled for early in 1986.

MOSCOW-PULLMAN EAS
CASE NO. U-1002-55

Extended area service (EAS), or toll-free telephone service, between Moscow, Idaho, and Pullman, Wash., was ordered in November by the Commission.

The Idaho Commission's order followed one issued by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

In its order, the Idaho Commission said it would consider the cost of the Moscow-Pullman EAS implementation at the same time it considered General's rate case.

A sufficient community of interest for the toll-free service was found by the IPUC, which said its absence "constitutes an unwarranted barrier to basic service of current importance to the Palouse community of common economic, civic, educational, and personal activities."

"We find the common interests of Pullman and Moscow require a system that works as if it were one exchange, and we do so in confidence that the benefits that will flow from the decision include many we cannot predict."

Joint public hearings were held by the Idaho and Washington commissions and the WUTC conducted an election in Pullman on the matter. Pullman customers voted in favor of the EAS.

Under Idaho law, the Idaho Commission is vested with the sole responsibility of making determinations on factual issues related to the public interest in public utility matters. It, therefore, did not order a plebiscite in Moscow.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE WEST

Continental Telephone Co. of the West was granted in 1985 a \$490,000 revenue increase -- far less than the \$1.2 million the company had requested.

The Commission also ruled that it had no jurisdiction over Continental's Oregon operations.

Continental Telephone, a Bakersfield, Calif.-based company, serves some 13,000 customers in 20 scattered rural communities, including McCall and Homedale in the western portion of the state and Aberdeen in the eastern half. Homedale is the utility's Idaho headquarters.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE COMPANY CASES:

RATE INCREASE APPROVED CASE NO. U-1037-51

In March, Continental was granted a \$490,000, six percent revenue increase that boosted all local rates and charges by an average 20 percent and basic monthly exchange rates by an average 26 percent.

The utility applied in September 1984 for an overall \$1.2 million, 16 percent revenue increase -- a proposal that would have increased its revenue from all local rates and charges by 55.7 percent and from its basic monthly exchange rates by an average 74.4 percent.

Because Continental collects a large portion of its annual revenue from long-distance, which was not affected by the case, the impact of the decision was much less on the company's total annual revenues than on revenues from local rates and charges, such as basic exchange service and hookup charge.

By the Commission order, the basic one-party residential rate increased an average 26 percent, ranging from \$11.65 to \$15.15. Continental's basic one-party residential rate before the increase had varied from \$8.80 to \$12.10 per month, depending on the size of the local exchange.

As before, business rates were double residential rates.

Extra charges for customers living in rural areas outside the communities' central exchange area were reduced on the average, and simplified.

The Commission also allowed Continental to recoup much of the investment it made since 1982 to upgrade its facilities.

Continental's allowable return on common stock was dropped from 14.25 to 14.1 percent. It wanted a 16.19 percent return on equity.

OREGON JURISDICTION
CASE NO. U-1037-53

The Commission ruled in November that it had no jurisdiction to regulate rates and charges for service provided by Continental in its Oregon exchanges.

Continental wanted the Commission to retain jurisdiction for the company's 583 customers in the Jordan Valley, Adrian and Ridgeview exchanges in Oregon.

The Commission said for some time it had been able to serve the interests of people on both sides of the state border by assisting in customer complaints and implementing local rates that Continental presented for concurrence by the Oregon Commissioner.

The commissioners added, however, "we have lost that ability due to the extreme changes that have occurred since the divestiture of AT&T."

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

During 1985 AT&T's first Idaho rate case was concluded by the Commission. Prior to the January 1984 AT&T divestiture, the company did not provide in-state long-distance calling.

The case also was the Commission's first that dramatically demonstrated how stand-alone telephone service costs increase in low-density areas such as Idaho when they are broken off from what was once a larger, integrated system.

AT&T also was actively engaged in Commission proceedings to establish an access charge formula.

In October, the in-state long-distance company returned to the Commission seeking a \$3 million general rate increase.

RATE INCREASE ALLOWED
CASE NO. U-1142-2

Authorization of a \$700,000, 7.8 percent rate increase in May concluded AT&T's first Idaho rate case and boosted to \$2.8 million the total amount granted by the Commission.

Earlier in the year, the Commission granted a temporary \$2.1 million hike. With the additional \$700,000, AT&T realized a 31.3 percent increase. The company had requested \$4.4 million, or 44 percent.

The Commission, however, ordered a freeze on long-distance rates for AT&T calls between communities that were 55 miles away or less. As a result, those rates, increased after the temporary rate boost in February, dropped back down by 24 percent to their earlier levels.

All other AT&T in-state regular long-distance calls, WATS lines and NETCOM (used by the State of Idaho) calls increased on the average by an additional 9.7 percent, or a total 36 percent.

AT&T also was allowed to increase rates for private lines (dedicated lines often used by businesses for data transmission, among other things) by an average additional 23 percent, or a total average 47 percent.

RATE INCREASE REQUESTED
CASE NO. U-1142-6

In October, AT&T informed the Commission it needed an additional \$3 million in revenue, asking that rates for long-distance service between the state's long-distance calling areas be increased across-the-board by 18.5 percent.

AT&T also asked for changes in the time-of-day discount rates and for an additional increase in in-state long-distance rates for calls under 55 miles.

Further, the company proposed a new optional calling plan which would discount rates on calls under 55 miles handled by AT&T between the state's long-distance calling areas.

AT&T claimed the increase was necessary because the company was losing money in Idaho.

Shortly after the start of 1986, AT&T withdrew its rate request. The telephone utility said it wanted to monitor the impact of a Commission order providing a formula to divide total Idaho telephone facility costs between local and long-distance companies and as well as other changes resulting from Commission orders.

PRO-IDAHO CALLING PLAN
CASE NO. U-1142-7

AT&T was allowed in September to initiate a new optional telephone calling plan, PRO-Idaho.

Under the PRO-Idaho plan, subscribers receive for a \$10 monthly charge a 15 percent discount on direct dialed in-state long-distance telephone calls. It does not include directory service, conference service, operator or calling card calls.

OTHER TELEPHONE COMPANIES

INLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY:

A change in Inland Telephone Co. rates that dropped monthly bills for more remote rural customers and slightly increased basic rates for those living in Lenore and Gifford exchanges was approved in March. The company was authorized to eliminate all extra mileage charges living outside exchange areas and to charge one-party residential customers a flat \$9 per month (\$14.50 for business); two-party, \$7.75 per month (\$10.50 for business); and four-party, \$7 per month (\$10 for business). Inland also was permitted to end the availability of four-party service to new customers, but existing customers could remain on four-party service. Inland serves some 200 customers in Lenore and Gifford and surrounding rural areas in northern Idaho.

MIDVALE TELEPHONE COMPANY:

Midvale Telephone Company was denied by the Commission to extend phone service into the mountain community of Yellow Pine, located 43 miles east of McCall. The Commission said the high cost of installing and maintaining service to the remote town was not justified by the estimated 20-30 additional customers the phone company could serve. Commissioners found the project's initial cost of \$270,000, plus estimated annual operating costs of \$56,000, made it unfeasible. The company serves the town of Midvale and a large section of rural Washington County.

In October, the Commission agreed to allow Midvale to obtain a \$341,500 loan from the Rural Electrification Administration. The loan was sought for physical plant improvements and replacements. Midvale also planned to construct a new office building and warehouse as well as obtain a new switchboard and standby generator.

SILVER STAR TELEPHONE COMPANY:

Proceedings were commenced in April by the Commission against Silver Star Telephone Co., that could result in the cancellation of the company's certification to provide phone service in Idaho. Since the mid-1970's, the Commission has received many protests from Silver Star customers complaining of difficulty placing calls, phone outages, noise on the line

and generally poor customer service. Shortly after the start of 1986, the Commission rescinded the operating certification of the Freedom, Wyo.-based company, which serves the rural Idaho communities of Wayan and Irwin. A final determination was held in abeyance until the end of 1986 to allow the company an opportunity to improve service and customer relations.

RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY:

Rural Telephone Co. of Sacramento, Calif. applied to the Commission in September for permission to operate a new telephone exchange at Prairie in Elmore County to serve approximately 190 square miles from the South Fork of the Boise River to Atlanta. The application was approved by the Commission in October.

CAMBRIDGE TELEPHONE COMPANY:

Cambridge Telephone Co. was given approval by the Commission in November to borrow \$931,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration for expansion and upgrading of its telephone service. Cambridge plans to construct 61 miles of new line to serve 218 new subscribers on a one-party basis, to provide related system improvements at Cuprum, Indian Valley and Lowman and to construct a new central office in Indian Valley. IPUC approval will be necessary prior to any expenditure of funds.

OTHER TELEPHONE ISSUES

TIME-OF-DAY CHARGES:

Pacific Northwest Bell

In January, the Commission prohibited Pacific Northwest Bell from charging customers 25 cents for each time-of-day announcement phone call they make. PNB in mid-1984 contracted with Tel-Time, a private company, to begin offering time-of-day service to Pacific's Idaho customers by Sept. 1, 1984. Tel-Time would have been required to pay PNB 15 cents for each time-of-day call it provided, but it would have collected a net 10 cents because it planned to charge 25 cents per call, billed to the customer by PNB. The Commission intervened in August 1984 and conducted a public hearing in September in Lewiston. PNB contended that the AT&T divestiture categorized time-of-day as an "information" service, which must be opened to competition. The Commission countered that one goal underlying competition in the telecommunications industry was to "keep costs down. However, PNB's agreement with Tel-Time increases costs dramatically over what it had cost PNB to provide this service in the past." Pacific serves about 20,000 customers in the Lewiston, Lapwai, Craigmont and Grangeville communities.

AUTOMATIC DIALING DEVICES:

Consumer protection rules for telephone soliciting systems that automatically dial customer numbers then give the person who answers a recorded commercial message were adopted in 1985 by the Commission. The Commission issued an order that limits dialing devices to those that free the line as soon as the customer hangs up. Some systems engage the phone line until the taped message is completed, even if the customer already has hung up, making it impossible to make or receive calls until the end of the recording. Further, the Commission order limited unsolicited automatic calls to between 9 a.m. and 9 p.m.

INDEPENDENT COIN TELEPHONES:

T.J. Tallman Co.

In June, the Commission ruled private businesses or individuals complying with Commission consumer protection guidelines could offer pay phone service in Idaho and set their own rates. Previously, only regulated local telephone companies such as

Mountain Bell, General Telephone and Continental had a monopoly over pay phone service. Commission action was prompted by a 1984 decision by the Federal Communications Commission, which said private businesses or individuals could connect their own coin phones to the interstate telephone network. Local telephone companies connect the pay phones and bill their owners as they would for any other business phone.

WATER COMPANIES

BOISE WATER CORPORATION:

Boise Water Corp. applied to the Commission twice during the year for rate increases. In March the company, which serves 41,000 customers in the Boise metropolitan area, asked for a \$1.8 million rate boost. Later the water utility voluntarily reduced its 21 percent rate hike to \$1.15 million, or 13.5 percent. In August the Commission denied in full Boise Water's request, noting that IPUC calculations found the company's fair rate level actually showed that rates should be reduced by a fraction of one percent. Boise Water returned to the Commission in December seeking authorization to increase annual operating revenues \$1.5 million, or 16.98 percent. Under the requested rates, the average residential water bill would increase approximately \$32 per year. The company said the increase was necessary to gain a more equitable return on the firm's rate base. Action on the second rate request was pending at year's end.

KETCHUM SPRING WATER COMPANY:

In July, petitions signed by 91 Ketchum residents were submitted to the Commission, complaining the utility was not providing adequate water pressure for fire protection and normal household uses. Petitioners said the low water pressure posed a serious hazard to their health and safety. They asked the Commission to require Ketchum Spring improve its water system. Commissioners asked the company to answer the complaint, but took no action pending legal action in District Court involving the utility.

McGUIRE ESTATES WATER COMPANY:

McGuire Estates Water Co. was allowed to keep its \$7.50 per month rates, but the Commission ordered the tiny Post Falls utility to make a number of improvements to its system. The Commission was responding to a petition filed by 35 of the company's 55 customers, complaining of the company's IPUC-authorized increase in rates for unlimited water use from \$5 to \$7.50 in November 1984 and of poor water pressure. McGuire Estates was ordered to take steps to improve water pressure to the subdivision as well as to upgrade its maintenance of hydrants and to generally improve maintenance and bookkeeping for the entire system. McGuire asked the Commission in October to allow it to increase its flat customer

rate by \$14.50 per month. The company said it was operating at a loss in serving its 57 Kootenai County customers and asked permission to boost its present flat rates from \$7.50 to \$22 per month per dwelling. McGuire also sought an additional six cents per 100 gallons per dwelling for each 100 gallons over 4,500 gallons. The request had not been acted upon by the end of the year. If approved, it would provide the company with a net increase of \$27,359.

HAYDEN PINES WATER COMPANY:

Hayden Pines Water Co. was authorized in October to provide water service to the Atlas Acres Subdivision located approximately two miles east of Rathdrum in Kootenai County. The Commission said it was in the public interest to grant the authority since Hayden Pines had owned the Atlas Acres Subdivision water system since July 1981.

BARBER WATER CORPORATION:

In September, Barber Water Corp. sought authority to boost its rates for its some 200 customers in the Golden Dawn and Barberton Mobile Home subdivisions east of Boise. The company wants to raise monthly rates from \$8.85 to \$9.90, which would provide the utility with an increased annual revenue of \$2,530. Barber Water also requested authority to charge a \$15 connection and disconnect fee. At the end of the year, the case still was pending.

SOUTH COUNTY WATER COMPANY:

A request by South County Water Co. to increase reconnection fees and to change tariffs to make a multi-housing unit owner and not the individual tenant responsible for payment for service was denied in November by the Commission. The Commission ruled the utility, landlord and tenants were protected by IPUC rules pertaining to service termination. In rejecting South County's request to increase its reconnection fees from \$6 to \$15 during business hours and from \$10 to \$20 for after service hour reconnections, the Commission said the company failed to provide cost justification to support its request. Commissioners also denied South County's petition to extend its service area, saying the company failed to apply for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity as required by Idaho law prior to doing any construction.

EAGLE RANCH WATER COMPANY:

In October, the Commission found that complaints against Eagle Ranch Water Co., Inc., near Boise, of low water pressure were from over-consumption and not inadequate capacity and ordered metering for all customers. A staff evaluation estimated that metering would reduce consumption by approximately 30 percent in the summer months when pressure complaints occur. The Commission said when Eagle Ranch certification was granted, the company was ordered to meter customers when it reached 300 -- a figure already exceeded by 200.

HILLCREST WATER CORPORATION:

Attempting to resolve a complaint filed against Hillcrest Water Corp. of Boise, the Commission in January suggested Boise Water Corp. buy the tiny water utility. Transferred customers would be required to pay an extra amount each month for three years to cover the purchase price. Boise Water would upgrade the facilities.

REGULATED CARRIER DIVISION

The IPUC's Regulated Carrier Division in 1985 continued to strengthen its investigative and enforcement training in hazardous materials, highway safety and economic enforcement. The Commission made a major ruling regarding Union Pacific Railroad Company's proposal to close rural agency stations and continued its policy of streamlining application proceedings to avoid unnecessary hearings and delays.

INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT:

In 1985, the IPUC's four Regulated Carrier investigators continued to receive special training from the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Transportation Safety Institute with the aim of becoming more actively involved in investigation, enforcement and cleanup logistics of hazardous materials. This as increased expertise allows IPUC personnel to aid other state and federal agencies with hazardous material enforcement and hazardous spill cleanup. In particular, this free training has allowed the IPUC to assist the U.S. Department of Transportation with successful investigations and prosecution of safety violations of vehicles carrying hazardous materials or hazardous wastes over Idaho highways.

Regulated Carrier personnel have also been actively involved with the regional response team that coordinates hazardous spill cleanup and public safety. The response team is coordinated with the states of Washington, Oregon and Alaska.

RAILROAD AGENCY CLOSURES:

In December 1983, the Union Pacific Railroad Company applied for permission to close 26 rural station agencies. The railroad maintained that freight service would continue to function unchanged in the affected communities, but customers would make shipping arrangements over a toll-free line to one of eight regional centers. Each center would be equipped computerized systems for billing and shipping coordination.

After a series of five hearings were held throughout the state, the Commission determined that the railroad should be given the opportunity to put its customer service center to the test. In an Order issued on August 9, 1985, the Commission stated that it would require the railroad to provide a list of all shippers served by the various agencies to the Commission Staff.

The Regulated Carrier Staff will contact shippers after the end of a one-year trial period. At that time, the IPUC may allow permanent closure of all or some agencies. If the system does not operate as promised by the railroad, the Commission could direct reopening of some agencies.

In southcentral Idaho, the Commission allowed trial closure of the Buhl, Burley, Jerome/Wendell and Minidoka agencies. The Shoshone/Gooding agency is maintained at its present status.

In Northern Idaho, the agencies at Coeur d'Alene and Orofino are closed. Sandpoint and Bonners Ferry operate as a dual agency and the stations at Kellogg and Moscow remain open.

In Southeast Idaho, the railroad was allowed to close the agencies at American Falls, Blackfoot, Arco, Shelley and Rexburg. The agency at Aberdeen remains open. Finally, the railroad was allowed to maintain an agency in the upper Snake River valley at either St. Anthony, Ashton or Newdale.

The railroad will close the agencies at Caldwell, Payette, Parma, Glenns Ferry/Mountain Home and Cascade. Weiser and Boise remain open.

MOTOR CARRIER ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

The Motor Carrier Advisory Committee was organized during 1985. The director of the Regulated Carrier Division maintained an active role on the Committee, especially with regard to reporting the status of a liability insurance problems faced by regulated carriers. Motor Carrier representatives were elected throughout the state as well as personnel from the Idaho Transportation Department and the Department of Law Enforcement. The Committee reviewed and endorsed bills regarding hazardous materials and insurance regulation.

COMMON-CONTRACT INTRASTATE CARRIERS CASE LIST FOR 1985:

The following applications, notices and complaints were received by the IPUC during 1985.

Applications for New Authority	55
Applications for Temporary Authority	35
Requests for Extensions of Temporary Authority	0
Applications for Amendment of Authority	11
Applications for Transfer of Authority	22
Applications for Voluntary Suspension	27
Applications for Voluntary Cancellation	12
Requests for Name Change	6
Requests for Extension of Compliance Period	28
Complaints	92
Notices Revoking Authority	8

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

The Consumer Assistance Division is responsible for mediating and, if necessary, arbitrating disputes between consumers and utilities, monitoring compliance with the Commission's orders and regulations, and representing consumers' interests in formal cases before the Commission. Staff members provide assistance to both residential and business utility customers, and work closely with utility representatives to insure that consumers are treated fairly. The types of issues the division becomes involved with include the quality and availability of utility services, rate design, and utility policies and practices which directly effect consumers (i.e., deposit and disconnection guidelines and budget payment programs.)

In order to meet the needs of consumers throughout the state, Consumer Division staff members are available from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., including the noon lunch hour. The majority of consumer contacts with the Commission are made via telephone, and most disputes are resolved without requiring the consumer to file a written complaint or visit the Commission's office in Boise. Division staff members will make referrals to social service agencies, financial aid programs, or budget counseling services where appropriate, and will negotiate payment arrangements with utilities on behalf of consumers.

The number of complaints and inquiries received by the Consumer Assistance Division during 1985 did not change significantly from the previous year. Thirty-five percent of all complaints and inquiries received by the division in 1985 involved a pending or actual disconnection of utility service. Other categories include: general information (18%); disputed billings (16%); rates and policies (10%); service-related problems (6%); line extensions and upgrades (3%); deposits (3%); company refusal to serve (2%); and miscellaneous (7%).

The Consumer Assistance Division received 1,939 requests for assistance in 1985. This translates into an average of eight requests each working day. Considering that every complaint filed with the division requires a minimum of two additional contacts (one with the utility/respondent to gather facts and another informing the complainant of the investigator's proposed resolution) in the course of investigation, considerable pressure is brought to bear upon investigators for a prompt and equitable solution to complainants' problems within a very short time frame. The majority of the complaints received concern "gray areas" where interpretation of tariffs, rules, or regulations, with consideration for the customer's or company's unique circumstances, is required. In approximately

one-half of all cases, the utility's action is either reversed or modified. One-third of the cases involve negotiation of payment arrangements.

COMPLAINTS & INQUIRIES RECEIVES
BY THE CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION
1984 & 1985

ENERGY UTILITIES

<u>Company</u>	<u>No. of Complaints</u>	
	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Citizens Utilities	0	4
Idaho Power	672	616
Pacific Power & Light	8	15
Utah Power & Light	96	69
Washington Water Power	86	105
Intermountain Gas	228	280

TELECOMMUNICATIONS UTILITIES

AT&T Communications	16	18
Albion Telephone	2	3
Cambridge Telephone	1	3
Century Telephone	6	2
Continental Telephone	28	42
Gem State Utilities	4	3
General Telephone	71	50
Inland Telephone	1	2
Midvale Telephone	1	0
Mountain Bell	598	476
Pacific Northwest Bell	31	14
Pine Telephone	0	0
Potlatch	1	0
Rockland	0	1
Rural Telephone	0	1
Silver Star	7	8
Troy Telephone	0	0

WATER UTILITIES

<u>Company</u>	<u>No. of Complaints</u>	
	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Barber Water	0	0
Bar Circle "S" Ranch	0	0
Boise Water	57	45
Brian Water	0	0
Capitol Securities Water	1	9
Citizens Utilities Water	0	2
Clearview Water	0	0
Eagle Ranch Water	0	37
East Moreland	0	0
Ever-Green Landscaping	0	0
Falls Water	0	0
Hayden Pines	2	13
Hillcrest Water	2	0
Ketchum Springs Water Supply	2	7
Mc Guire Estates	0	0
Murray Waterworks	0	0
Northgate Enterprises	0	0
Picabo Livestock	0	0
Rathdrum Prairie Water	0	0
South County Water	2	3
Spirit Lake East Water	0	0
Sunbeam Water	0	0
Sunset Heights	0	0
Troy Hoffman Water	1	0
Warm Springs Mesa	0	0

PERCENTAGE OF COMPLAINTS CONCERNING
UTILITY SERVICE DISCONNECTION
1985

ENERGY

<u>Company</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Disconnect</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Idaho Power	616	296	48
Utah Power & Light	69	30	43
Washington Water Power	105	50	48
Pacific Power & Light	15	1	7
Citizens Utilities	4	1	25
Intermountain Gas	<u>280</u>	<u>110</u>	<u>39</u>
TOTAL	1,089	488	45

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mountain Bell	476	163	34
Continental Telephone	42	9	21
General Telephone	50	4	8
Pacific Northwest Bell	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>
TOTAL	582	178	31

WATER

Boise Water	45	13	29
-------------	----	----	----

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES RECEIVED
BY THE
IPUC CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION
1981 - 1985

BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES*

<u>Company</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Idaho Power	629	776	694	672	616
Intermountain Gas	138	368	338	228	280
Mountain Bell	648	925	996	598	476
Boise Water	75	80	80	57	45

NON-BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES*

<u>Company</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Utah Power & Light	58	57	71	96	69
Washington Water Power	56	66	57	86	105
Continental Telephone	41	55	45	28	42
General Telephone	68	67	90	71	50
Pacific Northwest Bell	13	15	29	31	14

*Utilities with over 10,000 Idaho customers.

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES RECEIVED
BY THE
IPUC CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION
PER 1,000 UTILITY CUSTOMERS
1981 - 1985

BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES*

<u>Company</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Idaho Power	2.63	3.23	2.89	2.72	2.49
Intermountain Gas	1.49	3.79	3.49	2.40	2.95
Mountain Bell	2.50	3.20	3.45	2.08	1.65
Boise Water	2.04	2.16	2.16	1.50	1.18

NON-BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES*

<u>Company</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Utah Power & Light	1.44	1.33	1.65	2.40	1.73
Washington Water Power	.85	.94	.68	1.03	1.27
Continental Telephone	3.19	4.23	3.46	2.15	3.23
General Telephone	1.04	1.01	1.35	1.08	.76
Pacific Northwest Bell	.64	.90	1.75	1.41	.64

*Utilities with over 10,000 Idaho customers.

UTILITIES BY CITY

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Aberdeen	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Continental
Acequia	Rural Electric	None	Project Mutual
Ahsahka	Clearwater Power	None	General
Albion	Albion Light	None	Albion Telephone
Almo	Raft River Coop	None	Albion Telephone
Alridge	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
American Falls	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Ammon	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Arbon	Idaho Power	None	Rockland
Arco	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Arimo	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Ashton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Athol	Kootenai Electric	None	General
Atlanta	Atlanta Power	None	Rural
Atomic City	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Avery	WWP	None	General
Avon	Clearwater Power	None	General
Baker	Idaho Power	None	Century
Bancroft	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Banida	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Banks	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Basalt	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Bayview	PP&L	None	General
Beilevue	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Berger	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Bern	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Blackfoot	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Blanchard	WWP	None	General
Bliss	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Bloomington	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Boise	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Bone	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Bonnors Ferry	Bonnors Ferry Light	WWP	General
Bovill	WWP	WWP	General
Bowmont	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Bridge	Raft River Coop	None	Albion
Bruneau	Idaho Power	None	Gem State
Buhl	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Burke	Citizens	None	General
Burmah	Idaho Power	None	Project Mutual
Burley	Burley Municipal	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Butte City	Lost River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Cabinet	Northern Lights	None	General
Calder	WWP	None	General

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Caldwell	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Cambridge	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Cape Horn	Idaho Power	None	No Service
Carey	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Careywood	Northern Lights	None	General
Carmen	Idaho Power	None	Century
Cascade	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Castleford	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Cataldo	WWP	WWP	General
Cavendish	Clearwater Power	None	General
Centerville	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Challis	Salmon River Coop	None	Custer Coop
Chatcolet	Plummer Electric	None	General
Chester	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Chubbuck	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Clark Fork	PP&L	None	General
Clarkia	Clearwater Power	None	General
Clayton	Salmon River Coop	None	Custer Coop
Clearwater	Idaho Co. Light	None	PNB
Clifton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Clover	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Cobalt	Idaho Power	None	Lemhi
Cocolalla	Northern Lights	None	General
Coeur d'Alene	WWP	WWP	General
Colburn	Northern Lights	None	General
Conda	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Coolin	Northern Lights	None	General
Copeland	Northern Lights	None	General
Corral	Prairie Power Coop	None	Continental
Cottonwood	WWP	None	PNB
Council	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Craigmont	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	PNB
Crouch	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Culdesac	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	PNB
Cuprum	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Dalton Gardens	WWP	None	General
Darlington	Lost River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Dayton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Deary	Clearwater Power/WWP	WWP	General
Declo	Declo Municipal	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
De Smet	Kootenai Electric	None	General
Dietrich	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Dingle	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Dixie	Idaho Co. Light	None	Continental
Donnelly	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Dover	PP&L	None	General
Downey	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Driggs	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Drummond	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Dubois	Dubois Electric	None	Mud Lake Co-op
Eagle	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
East Hope	PP&L	None	General
Eastport	Northern Lights	None	General
Eden	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Eddyville	WWP	None	General
Edgemere	Northern Lights	None	General
Elba	Raft River Coop	None	Albion Telephone
Elk City	WWP	None	Continental
Elk River	WWP	None	General
Ellis	Salmon River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Elmira	Northern Lights	None	General
Emida	Clearwater Power	None	General
Emmett	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Enaville	WWP	None	General
Fairfield	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Fairview	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Felt	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Fenn	WWP	None	PNB
Ferdinand	WWP	None	PNB
Fernan Lake	WWP	None	General
Fernwood	Clearwater Power	None	General
Featherville	Prairie Power Coop	None	Rural
Filer	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Filer Mutual
Firth	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Fish Haven	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Fort Hall	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Franklin	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Fruitland	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Farmers Mutual
Fruitvale	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Gannett	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Gardena	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Garden City	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Garden Valley	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Gem	Citizens Utilities	None	General
Genesee	Clearwater Power/WWP	WWP	General
Geneva	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Georgetown	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Gibbonsville	Idaho Power	None	Century
Gifford	Clearwater Power	None	Inland
Gilmore	Idaho Power	None	Century
Glenns Ferry	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Golden	WWP	None	Continental
Good Grief	Northern Lights	None	General
Gooding	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Grace	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Grand View	Idaho Power	None	Gem State

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Grangemont	Clearwater Power	None	General
Grangeville	WWP	None	PNB
Granite	Northern Lights	None	General
Grasmere	Idaho Power	None	Gem State
Greencreek	PP&L	None	PNB
Greenleaf	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Greer	WWP	None	General
Hagerman	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Hailey	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Hamer	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op
Hammett	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Hansen	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Harpster	Idaho Co. Light	None	PNB
Harrison	Kootenia Elec/WWP	None	General
Harvard	Clearwater Power	None	General
Hauser	WWP	None	General
Hayden	WWP	WWP	General
Hayden Lake	Kootenai Elec/WWP	WWP	General
Hazelton	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Headquarters	WWP	None	General
Heise	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Helmer	Clearwater Power	None	General
Heyburn	Heyburn Electric	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Hill City	Prairie Power Coop	None	Continental
Holbrook	UP&L	None	Albion Telephone
Hollister	Idaho Power	None	Filer Mutual
Homedale	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Continental
Hope	Pacific Power	None	General
Horseshoe Bend	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Howe	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Huetter	WWP	WWP	General
Humphrey	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Huston	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Idaho City	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Idaho Falls	Idaho Falls Electric	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Indian Valley	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Inkom	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Iona	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Irwin	Lower Valley Power	None	Silver Star
Island Park	Fall River Rural	None	Mt. Bell
Jerome	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Juliaetta	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	Potlatch
Juniper	Raft River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Kamiah	WWP	None	PNB
Kellogg	WWP	WWP	General
Kendrick	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	Potlatch
Ketchum	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Kilgore	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Kimama	Idaho Power	None	Project Mutual
Ki berly	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
King Hill	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Kingston	WWP	WWP	General
Kooskia	WWP	None	PNB
Kootenai	Pacific Power	None	General
Kuna	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Laclede	PP&L/Northern Lights	None	General
Lake Fork	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Lamb Creek	Northern Lights	None	General
Lane	WWP	None	General
Lapwai	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	PNB
Lava Hot Springs	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Leadore	Idaho Power	None	Century
Lemhi	Idaho Power	None	Century
Lenore	Clearwater Power	None	Inland
Leon		None	Inland
Letha	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Lewiston	WWP	WWP	PNB
Lewisville	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Lincoln	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Lorenzo	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Lost River	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Lowman	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Lucile	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Lund	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Mackay	Lost River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Malad City	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Malta	Raft River Coop	None	Albion Telephone
Marion	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Marsing	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Continental
Maryville	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
May	Salmon River Coop	None	Custer Coop
McCall	Idaho Power	None	Continental
McCammon	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Meadows	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Meadow Creek	Northern Lights/ Bonners Ferry light	None	General
Medimont	Kootenai Electric	None	General
Melba	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Menan	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Meridian	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Mesa	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Middleton	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Midvale	Idaho Power	None	Midvale
Minidoka	Minidoka Electric	None	Project Mutual
Mink Creek	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Montevieu	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Montour	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Montpelier	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Moore	Lost River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Moreland	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Moscow	WWP	WWP	General
Mountain Home	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Moyie Springs	Northern Lights/ Bonners Ferry Light	None	General
Mud Lake	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op
Mullan	Citizens	None	General
Murphy	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Murray	WWP	None	General
Murtaugh	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Myrtle	Clearwater Power	None	PNB
Naf	Raft River Coop	None	Albion
Nampa	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Naples	Northern Lights	None	General
Neeley	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Newdale	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
New Meadows	Idaho Power	None	Continental
New Plymouth	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Nezperce	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	PNB
Norland	Idaho Power	None	Project Mutual
Nordman	Northern Lights	None	General
North Fork	Idaho Power	None	Century
Notus	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Nounan	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Oakley	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Ola	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Oldtown	Pacific Power	None	General
Onaway	WWP	None	General
Orchard	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Oreana	Idaho Power	None	Gem State
Orofino	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	General
Orogrande	WWP	None	Elk City
Osburn	WWP	WWP	General
Ovid	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Oxford	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Paris	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Parker	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Parma	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Continental
Patterson	Salmon River Coop	None	Century
Paul	Idaho Power/Rural	Intermountain	Project Mutual
Pauline	Idaho Power	None	Rockland
Payette	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Pearl	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Peck	Clearwater Power	None	General
Picabo	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Pierce	WWP	None	General
Pine	Prairie Power Coop	None	Rural
Pinehurst	WWP	WWP	General
Pingree	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Pioneerville	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Placerville	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Plummer	Plummer Electric	None	General
Pocatello	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Pollock	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Ponderay	Pacific Power	None	General
Porthill	WWP/Northern Lights	None	General
Portneuf	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Post Falls	Kootenai Elec/WWP	WWP	General
Potlatch	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	Potlatch
Prairie	Idaho Power	None	Rural
Preston	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Priest River	PP&L	None	General
Princeton	Clearwater Power	None	General
Raft River	Raft River Coop	None	Albion Telephone
Rathdrum	Kootenai Elec/WWP	WWP	General
Reubens	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	PNB
Rexburg	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Reynolds Creek	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Richfield	Idaho Power	None	Gem State
Riddle	Idaho Power	None	Gem State
Rigby	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Riggins	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Ririe	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Riverside	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Roberts	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Robin	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Rock Creek	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Rockford	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Rockland	Idaho Power	None	Rockland
Rogerson	Idaho Power	None	Filer Mutual
Rose Lake	WWP	None	General
Roswell	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Roy	Idaho Power	None	Rockland
Rupert	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Project Mutual
Sagle	Pacific Power	None	General
St. Anthony	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
St. Charles	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
St. Joe	WWP	None	General
St. Maries	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	General
Salmon	Idaho Power	None	Century
Samaria	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Samuels	Northern Lights	None	General
Sanders	Clearwater Power	None	General

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Sandpoint	PP&L	None	General
Santa	Clearwater Power	None	General
Shelley	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Shoshone	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Silverton	Citizens	None	General
Smelterville	WWP	WWP	General
Smiths Ferry	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Soda Springs	Soda Springs Muni	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Southwick	Clearwater Power	None	General
Spalding	WWP	None	General
Spencer	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op
Spirit Lake	WWP	None	General
Springston	WWP	None	General
Springfield	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Stanley	Salmon River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Star	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Starkey	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
State Line	WWP	WWP	General
Sterling	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Stibnite	Idaho Power	None	(Radio Phone)
Stites	WWP	None	PNB
Stone	UP&L	None	Albion
Sublett	Raft River Coop	None	Albion
Sugar City	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Sunbeam	Salmon River Coop	None	Custer Co-op
Sun Valley	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Swanlake	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Swan Valley	Lower Valley Power	None	Silver Star
Sweet	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Tamarack	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Tendoy	Idaho Power	None	Century
Tensed	Clearwater Power	None	General
Terreton	UP&L	None	Mud Lake Co-op
Teton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Tetonia	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Thatcher	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Thornton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Three Creek	Idaho Power	None	Rural
Triangle	Idaho Power	None	Rural
Triumph	Idaho Power	None	None
Troy	Clearwater Power/WWP	WWP	Troy
Tuttle	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Twin Falls	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Tyhee	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Ucon	UP&L	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Victor	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Viola	Clearwater Power	None	General
Virginia	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell

<u>City</u>	<u>Electric Company</u>	<u>Gas Company</u>	<u>Telephone Company</u>
Waha	Clearwater Power/WWP	None	General
Wallace	Citizen's	WWP	General
Wapello	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Wardner	WWP	WWP	General
Warm Lake	Idaho Power	None	None
Warm River	Fall River Coop	None	Mt. Bell
Warren	Idaho Power	None	None
Wayan	Lower Valley Power	None	Silver Star
Weippe	Clearwater Power/WWP	WWP	General
Weiser	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Wendell	Idaho Power	Intermountain	Mt. Bell
Westmond	Northern Lights	None	General
Weston	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
White Bird	Idaho Co. Light	None	Continental
Whitney	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Wilder	Idaho Power	None	Continental
Winchester	WWP	None	PNB
Woodland	WWP	None	PNB
Worley	Worley Electric	None	General
Yellow Pine	Idaho Power	None	(Radio Phone)

UTILITIES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF
THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRIC UTILITIES

ATLANTA POWER COMPANY
P.O. Box 357
Fairfield, Idaho 83327
(208) 764-2310

CITIZENS UTILITIES CO.
High Ridge Park
P.O. Box 3801
Stamford, Connecticut 06906
(203) 328-8800

612 Cedar Street
Wallace, Idaho 83873
(208) 752-1174

IDAHO POWER CO.
P.O. Box 70
1220 West Idaho St.
Boise, Idaho 83707
(208) 383-2200

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.
Public Service Building
920 S.W. 6th Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 243-1122

313 North Second Avenue
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
(208) 263-3117

UTAH POWER & LIGHT CO.
P.O. Box 899
1407 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110
(801) 535-2000

30 North State
Preston, Idaho 83263
(208) 852-1916

25 East Main
Rexburg, Idaho 83440
(208) 356-7366

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
E. 1411 Mission Ave. (99202)
P.O. Box 3727
Spokane, Washington 99220
(509) 489-0500

501 East Lakeside
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814
(208) 664-0421

411 South Main
Moscow, Idaho 83843
(208) 882-7551

803 Main
Lewiston, Idaho 83501
(208) 743-5541

GAS UTILITIES

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CO.
P.O. Box 7608
555 So. Cole Road
Boise, Idaho 83707
(208) 377-6000

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
(SEE ELECTRIC UTILITIES)

PIPELINE COMPANY

HOLLY CORPORATION
2600 Diamond Shamrock Tower
717 No. Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 651-0311

TELEPHONE UTILITIES

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MOUNTAIN STATES, INC.

P.O. Box 5020 (80217)
1875 Lawrence St., Rm. 1535
Denver, Colo. 80202
(303) 298-6130

619 Bannock, 4th Floor
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 338-2880

ALBION TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 98
Albion, Idaho 83311
(208) 673-5335

CAMBRIDGE TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 86
Cambridge, Idaho 83601
(208) 257-3314

CENTURY TELEPHONE OF IDAHO, INC.

P.O. Box 1007
Salmon, Idaho 83467
(208) 756-3300

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 5246
1350 Norris Road
Bakersfield, Calif. 93388
(805) 393 4011

P.O. Box 127
Homedale, Idaho 83628
(208) 337-3222

GEM STATE UTILITIES

c/o Pacific Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 9901, 805 Broadway
Vancouver, Washington 98668
(206) 696-6941

GENERAL TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 1003
1800 41st Street
Everett, Washington 98201
(206) 258-5321

2115 Government Way
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814
(208) 765-4339

401 No. Second Ave.
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
(208) 263-0177

403 South Main
Moscow, Idaho 83843
(208) 882-0211

INLAND TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 171
Roslyn, Wash. 98914
(509) 649-2211

MIDVALE TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 7
Midvale, Idaho 83645
(208) 355-2211

MOUNTAIN BELL TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 7888 (83723)
999 Main Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 385-2000

PACIFIC NW BELL TELEPHONE

1600 Bell Plaza
Seattle, Wash. 98191
(206) 345-5921

TELEPHONE UTILITIES
(cont'd.)

PINE TELEPHONE SYSTEM INC.

P.O. Box 706
Halfway, Oregon 97834
(503) 742-2201

RURAL TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 540
Glenns Ferry, Idaho 83623
(208) 366-2458

POTLATCH TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 121
Kendrick, Idaho 83537
(208) 289-5701

SILVER STAR TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 226
Freedom, Wyo. 83120
(307) 883-2411

ROCKLAND TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 269
Rockland, Idaho 83271
(208) 548-2345

TROY TELEPHONE CO.

P.O. Box 25
Troy, Idaho 83871
(208) 835-2211

WATER UTILITIES

BARBER WATER CORPORATION
3550 Triplett Lane
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 345-9384

BAR CIRCLE "S" RANCH, INC.
8191 Loch Haven Drive
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
(208) 667-4621

BOISE WATER CORPORATION
P.O. Box 7488
Boise, Idaho 83707
(208) 362-1300

BRIAN WATER CORPORATION
P.O. Box 7345
Boise, Idaho 83707
(208) 342-4791

CAPITOL SECURITIES WATER CORP.
2626 Eldorado
Boise, Idaho 83704
(208) 375-0931

CITIZENS UTILITIES WATER
612 Cedar Street
Wallace, Idaho 83873
(208) 752-1174

CLEARVIEW WATER CORP.
1811 North 32nd
Boise, Idaho 83703
(208) 342-1619

EAGLE RANCH WATER COMPANY
P.O. Box 455
Eagle, Idaho 83616
(208) 939-0242

EAST MORELAND WATER CO.
270 N.E. Main Street
Blackfoot, Idaho 83221
(208) 785-5450

EVER-GREEN LANDSCAPING, INC.
Portneuf Road, Box 4404
Inkom, Idaho 83245
(208) 775-3573

FALLS WATER COMPANY, INC.
405 11th Street
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401
(208) 522-1300

HAYDEN PINES WATER CO.
8601 No. Hayden Pines Way
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
(208) 772-3619

KETCHUM SPRING WATER SUPPLY
P.O. Box 1498
Hailey, Idaho 83333
(208) 788-4051

MCGUIRE ESTATES WATER CO.
S. 1115 Cedar
Spokane, Wash. 99204
(509) 456-8819

MURRAY WATERWORKS
Box 426
Murray, Idaho 83874
(509) 924-2789

NORTHGATE ENTERPRISES
P.O. Box 2432
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401
(208) 523-2251

WATER UTILITIES
(cont'd.)

PICABO LIVESTOCK COMPANY
Picabo, Idaho 83348
(208) 788-2516

SUNBEAM WATER CO.
P.O. Box 5361
Pocatello, Idaho 83201
(208) 237-1110

PINE HAYDEN WATER SYSTEM
12065 Brighton Court
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
(208) 772-4634

SUNSET HEIGHTS WATER CO.
Route 1, Box 224-50
Salmon, Idaho 83467
(208) 756-3611

SOUTH COUNTY WATER CO., INC.
P.O. Box 7361
Boise, Idaho 83707
(208) 375-1130

TROY HOFFMAN WATER CORP.
920 Hoffman Avenue
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814
(208) 664-6208

SPIRIT LAKE EAST WATER CO.
c/o Hanson Properties, Box 7310
Spokane, Washington 99207
(509) 467-0770

WARM SPRINGS MESA, INC.
2843 Star Circle
Boise, Idaho 83706
(208) 344-2603

COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC UTILITIES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CLEARWATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 997
Lewiston, Idaho 83501
(208) 743-1501

NORTHERN LIGHTS, INC.
P.O. Box 310
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
(208) 263-5141

EAST END MUTUAL ELECTRIC CO.
528 "E" Street
Rupert, Idaho 83350
(208) 436-9357

PRAIRIE POWER CO-OP, INC.
Box 187
Fairfield, Idaho 83327
(208) 764-2214

FALL RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC
714 Main Street
Ashton, Idaho 83420
(208) 652-7431

RAFT RIVER ELEC. CO-OP, INC.
Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
(208) 645-2211

IDAHO COUNTY LIGHT & POWER
P.O. Drawer B
Grangeville, Idaho 83530
(208) 983-1610

RURAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 647
Rupert, Idaho 83350
(208) 436-4781

KOOTENAI ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box K
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
(208) 772-7551

SALMON RIVER ELEC. CO-OP
P.O. Box 384
Challis, Idaho 83226
(208) 879-2283

LOST RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box 417
Mackay, Idaho 83251
(208) 588-3311

SNAKE RIVER POWER ASSN.
P.O. Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
(208) 645-2211

LOWER VALLEY POWER & LIGHT
Box 188
Afton, Wyoming 83110
(307) 886-3175

SOUTH SIDE ELECTRIC LINES
P.O. Box 142
Declo, Idaho 83323
(208) 654-2313

NOTE: The Idaho Public Utilities Commission does not regulate cooperative or municipal telephone or electric utilities; however, they are listed as a courtesy.

MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

ALBION LIGHT & WATER PLANT
P.O. Box 163
Albion, Idaho 83311
(208) 673-5351

IDAHO FALLS ELEC. LIGHT DIV.
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402
(208) 529-1430

BONNERS FERRY LIGHT & WATER
P.O. Box 149
Bonners Ferry, Idaho 83805
(208) 267-3105

MINIDOKA ELECTRIC DEPT.
Minidoka, Idaho 83343
(208) 531-4101

BURLEY MUNI. DISTRIB. SYSTEM
P.O. Box 1090, 2020 Park Ave.
Burley, Idaho 83318
(208) 678-2538

PLUMMER ELECTRIC DEPT.
Plummer, Idaho 83851
(208) 686-1422

DECLO MUNI. ELECTRIC DEPT.
P.O. Box 141
Declo, Idaho 83323
(208) 654-6391

RUPERT ELECTRICAL DEPT.
P.O. Box 426
Rupert, Idaho 83350
(208) 436-9608

DUBOIS ELECTRIC SYSTEM
Box 27
Dubois, Idaho 83423
(208) 374-5241

SODA SPRINGS MUNI. ELEC.
LIGHT AND POWER DEPT.
9 West 2nd South
Soda Springs, Idaho 83276
(208) 547-2151

HEYBURN ELECTRIC DEPT.
941 18th Street, Box 147
Heyburn, Idaho 83336
(208) 678-8158

WEISER WATER & LIGHT DEPT.
55 West Idaho Street
Weiser, Idaho 83672
(208) 549-1965

WORLEY ELECTRIC DEPT.
Worley, Idaho 83876
(208) 686-1258

SOURCE: ELECTRICAL WORLD Directory of Electric Utilities,
1984-1985, 92nd Edition

TELEPHONE COOPERATIVES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CUSTER TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.

P.O. Box 324
Challis, Idaho 83226
(208) 879-2281

FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY, LTD.

P.O. Box 346
Fruitland, Idaho 83619
(208) 452-4241

FILER MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY

P.O. Box 89, 405 Main St.
Filer, Idaho 83328
(208) 326-4331

MUD LAKE TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE

P.O. Box 235
Dubois, Idaho 83423
(208) 374-5401

PROJECT MUTUAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE ASSOC., INC.

P.O. Box 366
Rupert, Idaho 83350
(208) 436-3131

COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC & GAS RATES
WITHIN THE STATE OF IDAHO

As of December 31, 1985

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Tariff	Straight	Residential	Residential
Changes	Residential	W/Water Heater	All-Electric
	(500 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
			(3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)

Average Monthly Billing

7-1-60	\$ 8.85	\$ 13.68	\$ 26.52
2-4-74	9.48	14.10	27.36
8-1-76	10.27	15.63	30.51
11-1-76	10.55	18.05	33.05
12-18-77	11.23	19.43	35.82
7-1-78	11.71	20.24	37.30
3-4-80	12.54	22.29	41.78
3-22-81	14.56	26.33	49.86
3-13-82	15.88	28.96	53.71
3-9-83	17.81	32.76	62.66
3-18-84	19.78	36.69	70.52
11-26-84	21.91	40.97	79.07

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

	Straight	Residential	Residential
Tariff	Residential	W/Water Heater	All-Electric
Changes	(500 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)

Average Monthly Billing

1-2-63	\$ 11.41	\$ 15.18	\$ 31.48	
1-25-71	11.55	16.36	28.46	
12-2-74	11.66	17.02	30.22	
1-28-76	13.42	19.56	34.96	
4-22-77	14.37	20.95	37.44	
2-24-78	12.68	21.85	40.20	
3-23-79	14.49	24.97	45.94	
3-28-80	18.25	31.46	57.88	
10-1-81	12.00	26.00	60.85	
11-2-81	13.80	29.90	70.40	
12-2-81	11.57	25.45	61.50	BPA Credit
2-9-82	12.53	27.58	65.91	
8-25-82	17.23	34.45	68.91	
2-8-83	17.93	35.86	71.72	
4-8-85	20.73	41.47	82.92	
10-1-85	20.91	41.82	83.63	

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff	Straight Residential	Residential W/Water Heater	Residential All- Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
Changes	(500 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo.)	(3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)

Average Monthly Billing

12-19-74	\$ 9.21	\$ 15.10	\$ 29.60	
8-3-76	9.99	16.67	32.77	
8-1-78	11.19	20.37	38.75	
3-4-80	11.87	21.75	41.50	
3-22-81	13.21	24.42	46.84	
10-1-81	12.65	23.30	44.60	BPA Credit
3-4-82	10.83	25.78	54.94	
10-1-82	15.60	31.20	62.40	
1-1-83	17.55	35.09	70.18	
3-7-83	19.31	38.61	77.22	
7-1-83	18.96	37.92	75.84	
11-1-83	20.63	41.26	82.52	
1-26-84	22.32	44.64	89.28	
3-19-84	22.55	45.09	90.18	
7-1-84	21.76	43.52	87.04	
1-1-85	23.85	47.69	95.38	
7-1-85	22.71	45.42	90.84	

UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff	Straight Residential	Residential W/Water Heater	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
Changes	(500 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo.)	(3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)

Average Monthly Billing

8-1-64	\$ 11.36	\$ 16.36	\$ 23.26	
1-1-69	11.82	17.04	25.55	
5-14-72	12.29	17.72	27.76	
1-20-75	14.98	21.58	33.82	
5-1-75	16.49	23.74	32.71	
1-1-76	18.95	27.30	42.79	
5-1-76	19.70	30.48	49.19	
10-3-77	15.68	32.95	57.50	
3-21-78	20.35	36.70	57.85	
1-1-79	23.18	41.81	65.77	
6-15-79	27.67	49.91	78.65	
4-1-80	33.88	62.33	99.11	
5-27-81	33.20	66.40	109.33	
10-3-81	34.37	68.73	113.16	
10-3-81	24.84	49.67	75.04	BPA Credit
10-1-82	29.99	59.98	91.55	
11-18-82	30.19	60.38	92.20	
5-4-84	29.42	58.84	94.44	
9-13-84	32.11	64.22	102.41	
2-15-85	38.73	77.46	112.86	
11-26-85	33.74	67.48	110.33	

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

	Straight	Residential	Residential
Tariff	Residential	W/Water Heater	All-Electric
Changes	(500 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo.)	(1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)

Average Monthly Billing

5-6 60	\$ 8.70	\$ 12.90	\$ 24.90
4-25-67	8.45	12.62	24.45
5-26-69	8.20	12.54	22.86
9-24-70	7.85	12.35	20.60
9-13-73	7.90	12.45	20.80
11-13-74	8.24	13.39	23.02
8-12-75	7.85	13.20	23.90
11-27-76	8.30	14.00	25.40
4-15-78	9.34	16.07	29.54
10-17-79	9.98	17.15	33.32
8-11-80	10.30	19.00	40.06
12-1-80	10.60	19.68	41.63
10-23-81	10.00	22.36	52.47
11-13-81	9.00	20.35	48.45
1-18-82	9.00	20.35	48.45
10-1-82	10.14	22.67	52.30
11-1-82	10.34	23.06	53.23
1-31-83	10.38	23.14	53.39
2-9-84	14.45	31.28	70.44
3-30-84	14.58	31.55	70.97
2-1-85	16.15	34.70	76.51
2-26-85	18.03	38.70	85.31
4-5-85	18.10	38.84	85.58

BPA Credit

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
-------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Average Monthly Billing

11-20-69	\$ 2.31	\$ 5.18	\$ 12.80
1-1-71	2.65	5.65	13.75
4-15-71	2.75	5.95	14.65
8-11-72	2.95	6.39	15.69
4-15-73	2.97	6.46	15.90
10-19-73	3.02	6.59	16.29
11-25-73	3.02	6.61	16.35
1-1-74	3.19	7.11	17.85
4-1-74	3.23	7.23	18.21
7-23-74	3.59	7.97	19.31
12-1-74	3.84	8.74	21.62
4-1-75	3.90	8.91	22.14
8-5-75	4.17	9.71	24.53
11-1-75	4.16	9.98	25.35
10-20-76	4.90	11.77	30.50
4-1-77	4.74	11.30	29.10
10-2-77	4.95	11.94	31.00
12-19-77	4.97	11.25	30.01
4-12-78	5.10	11.61	31.15
9-20-78	5.26	11.97	32.10
10-1-78	5.27	12.22	33.06
11-15-79	6.44	15.56	42.92
1-1-80	6.43	15.63	43.23
4-1-80	6.43	17.91	50.63
10-1-80	6.10	16.98	47.18
11-1-80	7.90	19.71	49.00
4-1-81	7.85	19.56	48.56
10-1-81	8.50	21.52	54.44
12-12-81	8.92	22.76	58.14
2-16-82	9.25	22.75	58.14
10-1-82	9.49	23.48	60.32
11-1-82	10.21	25.64	65.79
12-1-82	10.10	25.51	64.74
4-1-83	9.99	24.96	63.75
4-30-83	9.77	24.30	61.77
10-1-83	9.58	23.74	60.11
4-1-84	9.96	24.88	63.50
7-1-84	9.89	24.66	62.85
11-1-84	9.66	23.99	60.85
5-1-85	9.63	23.90	60.57
6-29-85	9.54	23.62	59.73
10-1-85	9.26	22.78	57.22
11-1-85	9.12	22.36	55.95

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY
GAS

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
<u>Average Monthly Billing</u>			
8-10-58	\$ 3.05	\$ 6.05	\$ 12.53
3-26-59	2.25	6.15	12.63
4-24-64	1.50	4.50	12.43
5-10-67	1.45	4.35	12.10
3-31-71	1.48	4.44	12.40
11-1-71	1.54	4.62	12.89
4-15-73	1.57	4.71	13.21
10-1-73	1.59	4.77	13.41
1-1-74	1.76	5.29	14.89
4-1-74	1.81	5.43	15.34
12-6-74	2.08	6.24	17.82
8-13-75	4.20	7.60	17.80
1-24-76	4.61	8.85	21.55
12-16-76	4.73	8.99	21.77
4-1-77	5.03	9.88	24.43
10-1-77	5.24	10.48	26.23
10-7-78	5.47	11.21	28.42
10-1-79	5.87	12.02	30.46
4-1-80	6.68	14.43	37.70
8-11-80	6.76	14.67	38.40
10-1-80	7.28	16.25	43.16
12-1-80	7.30	16.30	43.31
4-1-81	7.22	16.05	42.54
10-1-81	7.89	18.08	48.64
10-23-81	8.14	18.82	50.86
1-18-82	8.14	18.82	50.86
10-1-82	8.66	19.98	53.94
11-1-82	9.03	21.08	57.23
12-1-82	8.91	20.72	56.15
1-31-83	8.91	20.73	56.19
4-1-83	8.80	20.39	55.16
4-13-83	8.57	19.71	53.13
10-1-83	8.32	18.97	50.90
4-1-84	8.70	20.12	54.36
6-22-84	8.63	19.90	53.70
11-1-84	8.44	19.31	51.92
6-13-85	8.38	19.15	51.44
8-3-85	8.16	18.49	49.47
10-1-85	8.15	18.44	49.31
11-1-85	7.95	17.86	47.58
11-7-85	8.00	18.01	48.04